



PEETERS

THE ATTITUDES OF BYZANTINE CHRONICLERS TOWARDS ANCIENT HISTORY

Author(s): Elizabeth M. Jeffreys

Source: *Byzantion*, 1979, Vol. 49 (1979), pp. 199-238

Published by: Peeters Publishers

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44172683>

REFERENCES

~~Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:~~

~~https://www.jstor.org/stable/44172683?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents~~

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Peeters Publishers is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Byzantion*

JSTOR

THE ATTITUDES OF BYZANTINE CHRONICLERS TOWARDS ANCIENT HISTORY

The writing of histories was the most significant contribution to secular literature made in the byzantine world. Almost without interruption events were recorded, ordered and discussed by a sequence of writers, who can be conveniently classified into the broad categories of historians and chroniclers. Those who might be described as historians adopt an analytical approach in their narrative, while a chronicler lists events by years and usually in outline form only. One looks for a more thoughtful attitude in a historian, and for signs of his personality affecting the presentation of material. One might expect a more neutral attitude from a chronicler, though his selection of what is worth recording must inevitably reflect his prejudices as well as the tradition in which he works ⁽¹⁾.

Byzantine historians would include such diverse writers as Agathias, Genesios, Anna Comnena, Nicephoros Gregoras. These authors have chosen to describe what happened during their lifetimes and in the immediate past. Their introductory remarks become a *topos* : stirred by the momentous events through which they had lived, it seemed profitable to set down as accurately as possible the dramas they had witnessed, as an example to future generations ⁽²⁾. In style and content these histories are as varied as are the personalities and circumstances of their authors. Even so it

(1) Cf. H.-G. BECK, "Zur byzantinischen Mönchschronik", *Speculum Historiale* (Festschrift K. Adler, 1965), 188-197.

(2) See, for example, AGATHIAS, *Historiarum Libri Quinque*, ed. R. Keydell (Berlin, 1967), 3.1-4.11 ; ANNA COMNENA, *Alexias*, ed. B. Leib (Paris, 1937), Preface, 1 ; GENESIOS, *Historia de Rebus Constantinopolitanis*, Bonn ed. (1834), 1 ; LEO DIACONOS, *Historia*, Bonn ed. (1828), 1 ; JOHANNES KINNAMOS, *Historiarum Libri Septem*, Bonn ed. (1836), 1 ; NICETAS CHONIATES, *Historia*, Bonn ed. (1835), 1-7 ; GEORGIOS PACHYMERES, *De Michaelae Palaeologo*, Bonn ed. (1835), 11-12 ; NICEPHOROS GREGORAS, *Historia*, Bonn ed. (1829), 3-13.

would be a valuable exercise to assess the methods and attitudes they have in common, in order to appreciate more clearly the contributions made by each individual to the development of the genre⁽³⁾. Generally historians are well aware of their predecessors : to emulate, if not surpass, their classical and more recent forbears in style and presentation is a goal understood by both author and reader. But one wonders how large was the public reached by these books. The comparative rarity of the manuscripts of many historians suggests that once composed, the volumes lingered untouched in libraries, though plainly, as quotations indicate, they could be ferreted out on occasion⁽⁴⁾.

However the second category of writers, the chroniclers, are our present concern. Like the historians, the chroniclers come from all areas of the Byzantine world and appear at all phases of its development. But the copious copies surviving of, for example, George Monachos or Manasses' *Σύνοψις Χρονική* are sufficient witness that their works were read⁽⁵⁾. The aim of these chronicles was usually to record the chief events of world history from a specifically Christian standpoint; Synkellos and Theophanes, among others, occupied ecclesiastical positions. Since there were no precedents from the 'best period' of classical literature for exactly this type of historical survey, the chroniclers were freed from pressure to aim at fine writing. Their products are for the most part written in an unpretentious language that can only have increased their circulation.

(3) An excellent example is R. H. JENKINS, "The Classical Background of the *Scriptores post Theophanem*", *DOP* 8 (1954), 11-30.

(4) E.g. for the *Alexiad* two main manuscripts survive, with three apographs and three epitomes, and perhaps some manuscripts lost in the more recent past : B. LEIB, *op. cit.*, clxiii-clxxv ; for the *Chronographia* of Psellos there exists one manuscript only, E. RENAULD, *Chronographia* I (Paris, 1926), lxi. On the whole question see N. PANAYOTAKIS, "Λέων ὁ Διάκονος", *ΕΕΒΣ* 34 (1965), 42.

(5) Twenty-nine manuscripts (at least) for George Monachos ; see C. DE BOOR (ed.), *Chronicon* (Leipzig, 1904), xiii-lxi. More than seventy manuscripts for Manasses, see O. LAMPSIDES, "Ἱστορία τῆς κριτικῆς τοῦ κειμένου καὶ τῶν ἐκδόσεων τῆς Χρονικῆς Συνόψεως τοῦ Κ. Μανασσῆ", *Ὁ Βιβλιόφιλος* 13 (1959), 3-8 and "Notes sur quelques manuscrits de la Chronique de Manasses", *Akten des XI Internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses, München, 1958* (Munich, 1960), 295-301. On the other hand Malalas, the most influential of the popular chroniclers, survives directly in only one manuscript (see note 84 below).

Surveys of world history cannot avoid covering the same ground. Many of the chroniclers found the most straightforward solution was to copy their predecessors, frequently word for word : hence, in part at least, the plagiaristic tangle of the Logothete Chroniclers, masquerading under the guises of Leo Grammaticus, Theodosios Melitenos and Julius Pollux⁽⁶⁾. But with frequent repetitions changes and distortions occurred. The choice of topics and the alterations made can be significant both for the authors' state of mind and for that of their readers. I propose to consider here some aspects of one major block of repeated material : the introductory sections that deal with ancient history, with the legendary history of the Jews, Greeks and Romans from the Creation of the World to the beginnings of the Roman principate. This represents a popular interpretation of the past – that is, one that must have been widespread among those Byzantines who were literate without being learned. We shall be particularly concerned with the attitude shown towards the antecedents of the Empire, by noting what is included or omitted in the narratives. Material that was passed on through a number of writers must have had some significance, or fulfilled some need. One can perhaps observe in these areas the functioning of some Byzantine reflexes in their attitudes towards themselves. Here the ideas of the *Ῥωμαῖοι* on the nature of their Empire and its role in world affairs are reflected at an almost unconscious level.

It will be clearest to begin toward the end of the tradition, with the *Σύνοψις Χρονική* of Constantine Manasses. The underlying

(6) The Logothete chroniclers come only incidentally into the present discussion. For an analysis of their interrelationships see particularly, F. HIRSCH, *Byzantinische Studien* (Leipzig, 1876), 89-115 ; A. SERRUYS, "Recherches sur l'Épitomé", *BZ* 16 (1907), 1-52 ; M. WEINGART, *Byzantské kroniky v literatur e cirkevneslovanske I* (Bratislava, 1922), 63-83 ; G. A. OSTROGORSKY, *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 5 (1932), 17-37, now reprinted in V. I. SREZNEVSKIJ, *Slavjanskij perevod chroniki Simeona Logotheta* (London, 1971) ; G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantino-turcica I* (Berlin, 1958) (hereafter MORAVCSIK), 515-8 (Symeon), 500-2 (Pseudo-Symeon) ; A. P. KAZDAN, "Khronika Simeona Logofeta", *Viz. Vrem.* 15 (1959), 124-43 ; R. H. JENKINS, "The Chronological Accuracy of the 'Logothete' for the years A.D. 867-913", *DOP* 19 (1965), 89-112 ; and most recently the survey provided by A. MARKOPOULOS in his thesis, a prolegomenon to an edition of Pseudo-Symeon (Ioannina, 1978).

patterns in his choice of material have evolved for many centuries from their origins in earlier chronicles and now stand out in exaggerated form. Despite the sophistication of his language and the range of his reading Manasses' Chronicle met with an interested response from many levels of society. It was copied frequently, used by Glykas, paraphrased in prose, cited in the popular verse romances and translated into Bulgarian (7).

Manasses, who in all probability died in 1187 as Metropolitan of Naupaktos (8), was a man of education and literary sensibility who wrote in both prose and verse (9). He had connections with the court circle in Constantinople. He was sent, for example, on diplomatic missions (10) and addressed some of his surviving prose works to Manuel I (11). The Chronicle, too, shows Manasses' association with the court: it is dedicated to the Sevastocratorissa Irene, wife of Andronikos and sister-in-law of Manuel I. Perhaps because of his imperial patroness, and perhaps also because of the educational slant implied in the preface (12), Manasses wrote the Chronicle in political verse, a metre for which many of his contemporaries felt

(7) See notes 166-7 *infra*.

(8) N. A. BEES, "Manassis, der Metropolit von Naupaktos ist identisch mit dem Schriftsteller Konstantins Manassis", *BNJbb* 7 (1930), 119-130, especially 121. O. MAZAL, *Der Roman des Konstantins Manasses: Überlieferung, Rekonstruktion, Textausgabe der Fragmente* (Wien, 1967), 1.

(9) Prose: Letters and orations, e.g. ed. E. KURTZ, *Viz. Vrem.* 7 (1900), 621-645; 12 (1906), 69-98; 17 (1910), 302-322. Verse: e.g. Iambics, ed. K. HORNA "Das Hodoiporikon des Konstantins Manasses", *BZ* 13 (1904), 313-355; Leo STERNBACH, "Constantini Manassae Ecphrasis inedita", *Odbitka z ksiegi Pamiatkowej dla Prof. Ludwika Ćwiklińskiego* (1902), 1-10; *idem*, "Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte. Konstantins Manasses", *Jahresheften des österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts* 5 (1902), 65-94; *idem*, "Analecta Manassea", *Eos* 7 (1902), 180-194; *idem*, "Constantini Manassae versus inediti", *Wiener Studien* 23 (1901), 473-477. Political verse: Romance, see O. MAZAL, *op. cit.*; E. T. TSOLAKIS, *Συμβολή στη μελέτη του ποιητικού έργου του Κωνσταντίνου Μανασσή και κριτική έκδοση του μυθιστορήματος «Τὰ κατ' Ἀρίστανδρον καὶ Καλλιθέαν»*, (Thessaloniki, 1967); Chronicle, Bonn ed. (1837) — hereafter MAN. — edition forthcoming by O. Lampsides. See KRUMBACHER, 376-380 and MORAVCSIK, 353-356.

(10) Cf. K. HORNA, *op. cit.*

(11) E.g. E. KURTZ, *Viz. Vrem.* 12 (1906), 88-98.

(12) MAN. 7-9: "Since you have desired, as a foster-child of learning, that a clear and comprehensible treatise should be written for you, giving plain teaching in ancient history..."

distaste⁽¹³⁾. Manasses was apparently less than enthusiastic about undertaking the task proposed to him, though the labour of reconciling the many and contradictory sources seems to be amply compensated by the size and frequency of his reward⁽¹⁴⁾.

There follows now a summary of the first section of Manasses' Chronicle, to demonstrate the type of material contained in these surveys of world history.

Manasses begins his narrative with the Creation : in six days the Lord created the heavens and earth, the firmament and all living creatures, culminating in Adam and Eve, who were expelled from Paradise through Satan's temptation (27-341). Adam's descendants fell into depravity : at the time of the Flood only Noah and his family were saved (342-439). Noah's descendants multiplied ; the Tower of Babel was built and Seruch invented statuary. Abraham and Sarah migrated to Egypt (440-533). At this time, while Sesostris was powerful in Egypt, Belos (or Kronos) ruled in Assyria to be succeeded ultimately by Sardanapalus (534-644). The Chaldaeans overcame the Assyrians and Nebuchadnezzar took the Jews into captivity. Daniel interpreted Balshazzar's vision, before Darius the Mede (also known as Astyages) swept into power (645-723). Astyages was in turn superseded by his grandson Cyrus, who, in accordance with the prophecies of Daniel, was victorious over Croesus of Lydia, descendant of Gyges (724-846). Cyrus released the Jews from bondage and was succeeded by Cambyses and Darius, among whose expeditions was the invasion of Greece (847-905). Alexander of Macedon destroyed Persia ; at his death his own Empire was divided, leaving Egypt under the Ptolemies until Rome intervened (906-965).

Having pursued his narrative in this direction Manasses now proposes to revert to Greek and Jewish affairs (966-970).

(13) See M. J. JEFFREYS, "The Nature and Origins of the Political Verse", *DOP* 28 (1974), 143-195. It is not clear why Manasses chose to write his romance in political verse ; none of the surviving fragments discuss his motives.

(14) MAN. 12-17 : "I shall accept the onus of the task, though it is a difficult and burdensome matter, and involves much work. For my efforts in this writing are encouraged by the size of your presents and by your generosity, and the thirst which come from my toil and labour is slaked by your frequent gifts".

On Irene as a sponsor of literary activity, see F. CHALANDON, *Les Comnènes II* (Paris, 1912), 212-3.

Jacob's sons lived in Egypt, at first welcomed but later resented and oppressed : Moses induced Pharaoh to release the Jews, and led them into Palestine. After Moses departed this life, the Jews were led by a succession of Judges until they demanded a king : Saul was followed by David (971-1106).

During the reign of David war broke out between the Greeks and Trojans. Manasses asks his readers' pardon for not following the familiar version, for Homer's sweet tongue can distort the story (1107-1117).

Hekabe, wife of Priam, while pregnant with Paris, dreamt that she gave birth to a fire-brand. Priam resolved to destroy the child, who was thus exposed in a place called Parion and rescued by shepherds. Paris was eventually recalled by Priam, but he inadvertently killed a relative and was sent to Menelaos in Sparta. There he met the lovely Helen and abducted her in Menelaos' absence. They sailed first to Phoenicia, then to Egypt, where a temple of Herakles at the mouth of the Nile offered asylum. King Proteus learnt of Paris' misconduct and sent him back to Troy, keeping Helen in Egypt (1118-1209). Menelaos discovered the abduction and organized a joint expedition of the Greeks against Troy. News came that Helen was held by Proteus, but the rumoured wealth of Troy kept the expedition in being. The Trojans prepared their defences. A stalemate ensued until anguish over the death of Palamedes caused Achilles to withdraw from battle (1210-1283) : Odysseus had resented Palamedes' popularity and had contrived his death by stoning, through false charges of treachery. Achilles could only be induced to return to the battle by the death of Patroklos (1284-1353). When Hektor was killed by Achilles, Priam summoned help from the Amazons, King David and Tantanos of India : only David refused (1354-1376). During a truce in the fierce fighting Achilles fell in love with Polyxena, and was murdered by Deiphobos and Paris while negotiating a marriage (1377-1412). Pyrrhos came to Troy, but the city could only be taken by means of the wooden horse. Once captured, the land was ravaged and its inhabitants killed (1413-1452). But Fate had not finished with Menelaos : storm-tossed, he recovered Helen from Egypt, but found his brother dead when he finally returned home (1453-1471).

Manasses announces as his next subject Rome and how she acquired universal dominion (1472-1475).

Following the fall of Troy, Aeneas journeyed to Italy (for whose name there are two etymologies), where oracles dictated the site for a new city : Laurentum was the final choice and the city of Lavinia

was built, to the accompaniment of portents (1476-1559). Aeneas was succeeded by Ascanius (who founded Alba) and then by Amulius. Amulius' niece, Nemetor's daughter, bore twin sons, Remos and Romulos, to Ares. They were rescued by a wolf and then a shepherd (though Manasses reports that there are other interpretations). On reaching manhood, they restored Nemetor to his rightful position and Romulos, with due rituals, founded a city they called Rome (1560-1637). Kings succeeded Romulos : among them Tarquinius Superbus who bought the Sibylline Books. The rape of Lucretia by Tarquin's son put an end to the monarchy : consuls took the place of kings (1638-1699). The first consuls were Lucius Tarquinius, and L. Iunius Brutus who feigned madness to escape death and alone understood the Delphic oracle (1700-1750). Manasses dismisses the Roman Republic with a two-line list of consuls and a generalization about increasing strength. Finally came Caesar who adopted imperial authority (1751-1779).

Thus Manasses deals first with the Creation and Jewish history, which leads him to discuss the Kingdoms of Egypt, Assyria, Persia and of Alexander of Macedon. He returns to the Jews, the Exodus from Egypt and the eventual establishment of the Kings of Israel. Greek history is covered by a disproportionately long account of the Trojan War, from which Aeneas emerges to establish a new kingdom in Italy, and ultimately the City of Rome.

Like other chroniclers, Manasses writes from a Christian standpoint, and so his account of the Creation is couched in terms of the *Genesis* story⁽¹⁵⁾. Man's Fall and Redemption also become an essential element in the Chronicle as a whole, though this is not fully apparent from the first sections. Christ's Life on earth is one of the pivots of the narrative, though the Gospel story is reduced to emotive statements about the Crucifixion and takes up only a very small part of the Chronicle⁽¹⁶⁾. The history of the Jewish people, on

(15) Rather than in a quasi-scientific rationalizing manner, as in e.g. DIODORUS SICULUS I, 77 ff. Even so, see MAN. 144-8 on the earth being caused to give birth and cf. LUCRETIUS V, 783-820 or EMPEDOCLES in *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* I (ed. H. Diels and W. Kranz, Dublin and Zurich, 1961), 276 ff. for similar ideas.

(16) MAN. 1980-90 ; cf. 1981-2 :

τὸν Ἰησοῦν μου τὸν γλυκύν, τὸν τῆς ζωῆς ταμίαν,
ἐπὶ σταυροῦ καθήλωσαν Ἑβραῖοι καὶ Πιλάτος.

Cf. MAN. 2328-36, on Constantine's adoption of Christianity.

the other hand, the background to Christ's Life on earth, receives fuller treatment, partly at least as a transition to the histories of other peoples and empires.

It is in terms of empires that Manasses views the past. Every power that he discusses – except the Jews – had wide territorial dominions, and was ruled by a monarch. This perhaps reflects Manasses' own circumstances, as a subject of the Byzantine Emperor. The attitude is also part of the literary heritage he received from former chroniclers where the eschatology developed from the *Book of Daniel* has led to an emphasis on the succession of Empires. How central was this idea that monarchies and empires alone were worth consideration can be judged from the programme set out in the prologue⁽¹⁷⁾, where the topics to be discussed are expressed in terms of reigns and rulers⁽¹⁸⁾. Manasses then is here showing the reactions of a Byzantine influenced by his background both political and literary.

The modern reader will none the less be surprised to discover that Manasses omits some topics which might seem to be of prime importance. For the history of Rome, for example, he gives some of the legends associated with Aeneas, the founding of the city by Romulus and a few stories connected with the early kings. The Republic, however, is passed over with extreme haste⁽¹⁹⁾, in order to come from the first of the consuls to Julius Caesar, who re-established a monarchy. As for Greece, a modern historian, writing a similar survey, would dwell at some length on the city-states in the fifth century. He would discuss the personalities they threw up, their literature, their constitutional experiments and constant warfare. There is nothing of this in Manasses' account. There is complete silence on the affairs of the Greek communities from the end of the

(17) καὶ τίνες ἦρξαν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς καὶ μέχρι τοῦ προῆλθον
καὶ τίνων ἐβασίλευσαν, ἐτῶν δὲ μέχρι πόσων...

MAN. 10-11.

(18) Cf. E. BARKER, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium* (Oxford, 1957); F. DVORNIK, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy* (Washington, D.C., 1966), II, 611-58, 724-850; H.-G. BECK, *Res Publica Romana: vom Staatsdenken der Byzantiner*, SBBay Phil. Hist. Kl. (1970), Hft. 2. On the eschatological elaborations from *Daniel*, see note 101 below.

(19) See E. PATZIG, *Johannes Antiochenus und Johannes Malalas*, AbhThomasschule (Leipzig, 1892), 22.

Trojan War until the rise of Alexander of Macedon – both of which are periods of Greek imperialism⁽²⁰⁾. There is however one exception. The unsuccessful invasion of mainland Greece is mentioned during Manasses' survey of Darius' and Xerxes' imperial ventures⁽²¹⁾.

One should perhaps feel no surprise at these omissions : both can be explained in similar terms. A city state, such as Athens or Rome of the early Republic, represents a form of government whose transitory authorities and scale must have been almost incomprehensible when viewed from the centre of the Byzantine world-empire in the twelfth century. Yet Manasses is writing in Greek, aiming, like most of his contemporaries, at a form of the language whose style and conventions took shape in Greece during the period he ignores⁽²²⁾. The education and linguistic training he received was intended to reinforce an ideal Attic purity whose standards were first set by Greek authors of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Manasses demonstrates here a total lack of curiosity about the origins of his cultural heritage.

When one examines the sources of his Chronicle, it is immediately obvious that he is dependent on the chain of chronicle writers who stretch back to Malalas. The passages, for example, dealing with Kronos⁽²³⁾, Ninus⁽²⁴⁾, Sardanapalus⁽²⁵⁾, Seth⁽²⁶⁾, each have a long history in the tradition. Accurate discussion of sources

(20) For a general comment on the Byzantines' blindness to their Greek heritage, see N. JORGA, *Histoire de la vie byzantine* I (Bucarest, 1934), 238.

(21) MAN. 906, 909-915.

(22) G. BÖHLIG, *Untersuchungen zum rhetorischen Sprachgebrauch der Byzantiner* (Berlin, 1956), especially 1-17 ; R. BROWNING, "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century", *Byzantion* 32 (1962), 167-202 and 33 (1963), 11-40 ; P. LEMERLE, *Le Premier Humanisme Byzantin* (Paris, 1971), 242-65.

(23) MAN. 534-546. Cf. GEORGE MONACHOS (ed. C. de Boor, I, 11) ; Malalas (ed. V. Istrin, *Mémoires Acad. St. Pétersburg* I, 3 (1897), 5-19) 14 ; *Chronicon Paschale* (Bonn ed. 1832), I, 65 ; LEO GRAMMATICUS (Bonn ed. 1842), 15 ; CEDRENOS (Bonn ed. 1838), 28.

(24) MAN. 552-559. Cf. GEORGE MON. 12 ; Mal. 14 ; *Chron. Pasch.* 67 ; CEDR. 29.

(25) MAN. 585-634. Cf. GEORGE MON. 13 ; Mal. 16 ; *Chron. Pasch.* 68.

(26) MAN. 113-120, 373-374. Cf. GEORGE MON. 10 ; Mal. 6 ; LEO GRAM. 9 ; CEDR. 16.

within this tradition will only be possible when critical editions exist for all the chroniclers and the general structure of their interrelationships has been established.

The framework which Manasses uses appears not to be derived from any extant chronicle. He seems to know parts at least of Johannes Antiochenus, especially his section on Troy, but the fragmentary state in which this author survives makes it difficult to assess the extent of the debt ⁽²⁷⁾. Manasses' work also shares several structural similarities with those of George Monachos and Cedrenos ⁽²⁸⁾. The emphasis on Seruch, the first man to make an idol, and the abrupt switch back to Jewish history after a discussion on Alexander of Macedon are common to George Monachos and Manasses ⁽²⁹⁾. Detailed narrative of the Trojan War is included by Cedrenos and Manasses, though not by George Monachos ⁽³⁰⁾. Manasses, however, adds new points to the traditional elements. In the case of Sardanapalus he remarks that different versions are available ⁽³¹⁾; for the Trojan War he refuses to follow Homer ⁽³²⁾; elsewhere he seems to have emended without comment ⁽³³⁾.

In the prologue Manasses claims to have consulted a number of authorities whose accounts did not always agree ⁽³⁴⁾. A cursory examination of his material shows that this is no mere *αὔξησις* of his

(27) Cf. note 59 below and E. PATZIG, Johannes Antiochenus und Johannes Malalas, (as in note 19 above), 5; *idem*, "Die Hypothese in Dindorfs Ausgabe der Odysseescholien", *BZ* 2 (1893), 423-4.

(28) Cf. the passages noted above. Cedrenos is, of course, largely a reworking of Pseudo-Symeon (*Par. Gr.* 1712); see K. PRAECHTER, Quellenkritische Studien zu Kedrenos, *SBBay Phil.-Hist. Kl.* (1897), Bd. 2, Hft. 1, 1-107.

(29) Seruch: MAN. 484-496, cf. GEORGE MON. 57 ff. Alexander and his successors: MAN. 966-970 switches back to Biblical history, cf. GEORGE MON. 240.

(30) CEDR. 216-238 (derived from Malalas); GEORGE MON. 200, at the equivalent point, makes no mention of Troy.

(31) MAN. 623-624.

(32) MAN. 1110-1116.

(33) *E.g.* at MAN. 664 begins material based ultimately on the *Book of Daniel*: Nebuchadnezzar and Shadrach, Meschach and Abednego (*Daniel* 1 and 2); Balshazzar's Feast (*Daniel* 5); into this (at MAN. 724 ff.) is inserted matter on Darius/Astyages, Cyrus, Gyges which is derived from Herodotos (see note 58 *infra*). The narrative from *Daniel* provides the context for Persian history.

(34) MAN. 21-26.

method. Although he was working within a traditional genre, and one for which he probably did not have a high regard, Manasses was not content simply to retell in his own words the information collected by previous chroniclers.

The combination of passages dealing with Greek mythology and Eastern history inserted into a narrative derived from the Old Testament is an arrangement that has many precedents⁽³⁵⁾. But Manasses has reworked the Old Testament material. In retelling the story of the Creation and Adam's first descendants he appears to have gone directly to the Septuagint, and followed the opening chapters of *Genesis* with some closeness⁽³⁶⁾. But he has also paid considerable attention to the quality of his language: the Creation story has been turned into an extended *ἐκφρασις*, of a type well-known in Byzantine literature⁽³⁷⁾. Many parallels can be found for the lists of birds, plants, trees⁽³⁸⁾, but some of the descriptive phrases seem to be unique to Manasses⁽³⁹⁾. An image from cheese-making, however, which should enable the readers to visualize the separation of earth from water, is taken from a not entirely appropriate Homeric context⁽⁴⁰⁾. Again, Manasses devotes a certain

(35) Cf. CEDR. 28-46: mythological history; 47-101: biblical history; 101-3: Orpheus; 104: Herakles and the Argonauts; 105 ff.: biblical history.

(36) MAN. 26-71, cf. *Gen.* I, 1-12; MAN. 100-115, cf. *Gen.* I, 13-18; MAN. 144-145, cf. *Gen.* I, 20-21; MAN. 231-251, cf. *Gen.* II, 15-20; MAN. 277-285, cf. *Gen.* II, 21-25; MAN. 298-332, cf. *Gen.* III, 1-17; MAN. 338-341, cf. *Gen.* III, 16-18; MAN. 342-351, cf. *Gen.* III, 21-23; MAN. 346-374, cf. *Gen.* IV, 1-15; MAN. 385-435, cf. *Gen.* VI, 13-22, VII and VIII.

(37) E.g. MAN. 72-99: plants; MAN. 149-173: animals; MAN. 181-230: garden; MAN. 252-276: animals. Cf. O. SCHISSEL, *Der byzantinische Garten*, *SB Wien Phil.-Hist. Kl.* (1942), Bd. 221, Abh. 2; O. LAMPSIDES, "Φιλολογικά εἰς τὴν Χρονικὴν Σύνοψιν Κωνσταντίνου Μανασσῆ", *ΕΕΒΣ* 21 (1951), 163-73.

(38) E.g. at the head of the tradition, ACHILLES TATIUS (ed. E. Vilborg, Goteburg, 1955 and 1962), I, 15. See O. SCHISSEL, *op. cit.*

(39) O. LAMPSIDES, "Τὸ Λεξιλόγιον τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου Μανασσῆ ἐν τῇ Χρονικῇ Συνόψει", *Πλάτων* 23 (1971), 254-77; *idem*, "Τὰ ῥήματα ἐν τῷ Λεξιλογίῳ τῆς Χρονικῆς Συνόψεως Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Μανασσῆ", *Βυζαντινά* 5 (1973), 190-268.

(40) MAN. 51-59, especially 55-56:

ὥς εἴ τις γάλακτος λευκοῦ νοτίδα γλυκυχύμου
ὁπῶ συμπῆξει καὶ τυροῦ κύκλον ἀποτορνεύσει.

This is drawn from *Iliad* 5, 903-5 (where however it refers to the wounded Ares):

amount of space to material based on the *Book of Daniel*. This too is traditional, but once more he has altered what seems to be the expected version ⁽⁴¹⁾.

It is possible to point to a number of other sources. Manasses must, for example, have known the historical compilation of Zonaras, an older contemporary ⁽⁴²⁾. The stories of Romulus and the early kings of Rome, the Sibylline books and the first consuls as given by Manasses share some turns of phrase and many sequences of action with Zonaras ⁽⁴³⁾. Zonaras himself was here borrowing

ὥς δ' ὅτ' ὀπὸς γάλα λευκὸν ἐπειγόμενος συνέπηξεν
 ὕγρὸν ἑὸν, μάλ' ὅτ' ὥκα περιτρέφεται κυκώωντι,
 ὥς ἄρα καρπαλίμως ἵστατο θοῦρον "Ἀρηα.

For a few other Homeric parallels, see G. SPADARO, "Reminiscenze omeriche e sofoclee in Constantino Manassis", *Sicilorum Gymnasium* n.s. 25 (1972), 212-218.

(41) Cf. note 33 above and the Herodotean insertions listed in note 58 below. The material from *Daniel* appears in, e.g. CEDR. 204, 207-8 and GEORGE MON. 220.

(42) On Zonaras, see MORAVCSIK, 344-348. *Histories*: Bonn ed. (M. Pinder, I-XII, 1841-4; T. Büttner-Wobst, XIII-XVIII, 1897). On Manasses and Zonaras, see O. LAMPSIDES, "Ἡ Χρονικὴ Σύνοψις Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Μανασσῆ καὶ ἡ Ἐπιτομὴ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ζωναρά", *Νέον Ἀθῆναιον* 4 (1963), 3-20. See also F. MILLAR, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), 1-5; K. ZIEGLER, *RE* 10.1 (1972), cols. 718-732.

(43) Romulus: MAN. 1560-1610, cf. ZONARAS, VII, 4.14-7.2. Some phrases are close, e.g. MAN. 1569-1572:

...τὴν δὲ γε θυγατέρα
 ἱέρειαν πεποίηκε ναοῦ τοῦ τῆς Ἑστίας.
 νενομοθέτητο δ' ἄγνὰς τὰς ἱερείας μένειν,
 παρθενικὰς καὶ καθαρὰς καὶ γάμων ἀπειράτους.

Cf. ZON. VII, 6.6-7, 9-10: θυγατρὸς δὲ τῷ Νομίτορι οὔσης... ἱέρειαν τῆς Ἑστίας ἐκείνην ἀπέδειξεν, ἄγαμον διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παρθένον διὰ βίου μέλλουσαν ἔσεσθαι; MAN. 1604-5: ...ἑταίρα...λυκαίαν...λοῦπαν; cf. ZON. VII, 6.22 λυκαίαν... (6.24) λούπας...ἑταίρας. A number of the thoughts in Man. however (e.g. the existence of Numitor's sons: MAN. 1569; the licking of the children's faces: MAN. 1591; Faustus' wife's still-born child: MAN. 1595) are not present in Zonaras' account. Cf. the account of the building of the walls: MAN. 1620-38, ZON. VII, 9.16-10.4 where in particular the distinction between men and women is not in Zonaras (see note 45 for the question of Cassius Dio).

Sibylline books: MAN. 1657-71, cf. ZON. VII, 38.1-13 (the purchase of the books); MAN. 1672-83, cf. ZON. VII, 38.20-39.19. The sequence of material is followed though there are few close phrases (MAN. 1675 νεοσφαγοῦς, cf. ZON. VII, 39.2 νεοθνήτο; MAN. 1683 καποῦτ γὰρ ἡ κεφαλὴ κατὰ Ῥωμαίων γλώσσαν, cf. ZON.

from a variety of sources to which Manasses could also have had access⁽⁴⁴⁾, and probably did, especially in the case of Cassius Dio⁽⁴⁵⁾. But in view of the identical selection of material, one must suppose that the younger man started from the work of the elder.

Even more difficult to tie down is Manasses' relationship with Tzetzes' writings. The two share a number of recondite pieces of information : one wonders which of them produced these first. Both Manasses and Tzetzes, for example, discuss the blinding of Belisarius as an instance of the workings of envy, a historical distortion which was developed later in similar terms in the popular romance ; this version may have been previously known in the *Patria*⁽⁴⁶⁾. In his

VII, 39.2 *καπίτα γὰρ γῆ 'Ρωμαίων διαλέκτω ἡ κεφαλὴ ὀνομάζεται*. Man. is the more accurate). But again see note 45.

First consuls : MAN. 1700-50 (and 1683-99) : Brutus, son of the wronged Marcus, who pretended madness to escape death and alone understood the Delphic oracle, took action on hearing of the crime committed against Lucretia ; Cf. ZON. VII, 40.8-41.2 and 41.3-43.9 where the material follows in exactly this order, though with few convincing similarities in phrasing (e.g. ZON. VII, 41.1 *ὁ Βροῦτος ὡς τυχαίως καταπεσὼν τὴν γῆν κατεφίλησεν*, cf. MAN. 1743-4 *Βροῦτος.../πρηνὴς πεσὼν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκείνην κατεφίλει*).

(44) E.g. PLUTARCH, *Romulus* (esp. chaps. 3-6, 10) ; DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS (e.g. II, 13) ; Dio CASSIUS. All of these were also used by Tzetzes, with whose reading matter Manasses seems to have been acquainted.

(45) Cassius Dio bedevils the situation. His first books are extant only in the quotations of Zonaras and Xiphilinos, and so it is not easy to decide whether Man. is following Zonaras or Dio. Zonaras seems later to preserve a fuller text of Dio than that which survives (E. SCHWARZ, *RE* 3, cols 1684-1722). Could not the difference between Zonaras and Man. be explained by the fact that the latter was using a different text of Dio ? For the Romulus story there survives a separate fragment which seems to confirm this possibility : U. P. BOISSEVAIN, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani historiarum romanarum quae supersunt* (Berlin, 1895-1931), fr. 1, discussed at I, CXI-CXIV (cf. III, 791, *Excerpta maiana e Planude Florilegiis Suida petita*) : cf. MAN. 1620-36. Boissevain, on a delicate balance of probabilities, attributes this Planudean fragment to Johannes Antiochenus. TZETZES, however, in the Commentary to Lycophron's *Alexandra* at line 1232 (ed. E. Scheer, *Lycophronis Alexandra*, reprinted 1958, 354) describes the founding of Rome within the terms of Zonaras' text of Dio, but includes some of the details common to Manasses and the Planudean fragment. For similar problems, cf. BOISSEVAIN, *ibid.*, fr. 2 and MAN. 1672 ff, on the Tarpeian hill.

(46) MAN. 3229-47 ; cf. TZETZES, *Historiae* (ed. P. A. M. Leone, Naples, 1968) III, 339-358 (= Hist. 88) and *ibid.* IV, 750-8 : *Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, ed. Th. PREGER, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum* II (Leipzig, 1907), 159.17-160.14 : however the earliest manuscript of the *Patria* in which this story appears

section on Troy, Manasses stresses that Palamedes' unjust death was a factor in Achilles' withdrawal from battle. This corresponds to Tzetzes' vehement remarks about that hero, who seems in some way to have become a symbol of Tzetzes' own persecution, real or imagined⁽⁴⁷⁾. One suspects that some of Manasses' points (like Paris' involuntary murder of a relative) are owed to Tzetzes⁽⁴⁸⁾. But although Tzetzes had collected much supplementary information on the heroes and stories of the Trojan War in his extensive forays into the byways of Greek literature, one of the texts he used was the Trojan section of Malalas⁽⁴⁹⁾. As this also fed the main chronicle tradition, Manasses' possible debt here to Tzetzes is obscured.

It is no surprise that Manasses was acquainted with the work of his contemporaries and with the Old Testament, but he had also consulted at least two historians from earlier periods. He has turned to Dionysios of Halicarnassos' history of Rome for the story of Aeneas' settlement in Italy, for the oracles that accompanied it, and for the etymologies of some Latin words⁽⁵⁰⁾. Written in Greek and concerned with Roman antiquities, Dionysios' work would be an obvious source for extra information. There is a little evidence from

is dated to the early twelfth century. See E. FOLLIERI, "Il Poema Bizantino di Belisario", in *La Poesia Epica e la Sua Formazione, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Anno CCCLXVII*, 1970 Quad. No. 139, 583-615, especially 610-11.

(47) TZETZES, *Allegories on the Iliad* (ed. J. F. Boissonade, Paris, 1851), *Prolegomena* 927 ff.; *Historiae* III, 176 ff; cf. MAN. 1284-1332.

(48) MAN. 1148-9; cf. TZETZES, *Exegesis ad Iliadem* (ed. G. HERMANN, *Draconis Stratonicensis Liber de Metris Poeticis*, Leipzig, 1812), p. 42 as well as the scholion to *Iliad* E 64. See E. M. JEFFREYS, "The Judgement of Paris in Later Byzantine Literature", *Byzantion* 48 (1978), 127-8.

(49) E. PATZIG, "Malalas und Tzetzes", *BZ* 10 (1901), 385-93.

(50) MAN. 1475-94, cf. DION. HAL. I, 35 (ed. C. JACOBY, *Dionysii Halicarnassei antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt* I, Leipzig, 1885, reprinted 1967). *E.g.* MAN. 1484-7:

εἰς οὖν ἐκείνων δάμαλις τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγέλης,
ἀποσκιρτήσας, ὡς φασιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ βουκολίου,
τὸ μεταξὺ νηξάμενος πέλαιγος τῆς θαλάσσης
εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἴσχυσε διαπεραιωθῆναι...

DION. HAL. I, 35.2: ...ἐπειδὴ τις αὐτῷ δάμαλις ἀποσκιρτήσας τῆς ἀγέλης ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ ἔοντι ἤδη φεύγων διῆρε τὴν ἀκτὴν καὶ τὸν μεταξὺ διανηξάμενος πόρον τῆς θαλάττης εἰς Σικελίαν ἀφίκετο... Cf. MAN. 1495-1559: DION. HAL. I, 55, eating of parsley; I, 56, pregnant sow; I, 59, further portents on the founding of Lavinium.

his prose works that Manasses was acquainted with Dionysios' history⁽⁵¹⁾. Although Tzetzes also cites Dionysios frequently, in this case the closeness of wording as well as the hasty references to this material made by Tzetzes⁽⁵²⁾ make it almost certain that Manasses had gone back for himself to Dionysios' original text.

The other historian to whom Manasses turned was Herodotos, the father of rational history. Here again, though Tzetzes made extensive use of the *Histories* for material which was sometimes taken up by Manasses⁽⁵³⁾, the way in which Manasses' phrasing and sequence of thought reflects that of Herodotos makes it plain that he was not relying on an intermediary, nor on a series of excerpts⁽⁵⁴⁾. Quotations from Herodotos also appear in his prose works⁽⁵⁵⁾. Manasses is well aware that Herodotos' main theme was the conflict between Greece and the Persian barbarian, for he seems to summarize it briefly in connection with the Persian invasions of Mainland Greece⁽⁵⁶⁾. But the material he chose to borrow indicates the extent to which he was alienated from the Greek world in which

(51) E.g. E. KURTZ, *Viz. Vrem.* 12 (1906), 92.

(52) E.g. TZETZES, *Lycophr. Alex.* ad lin. 1232 (ed. E. Scheer), 353.17-25, with a very brief reference to the eating of parsley. This material does not appear in the *Historia*, though Dionysios of Halicarnassus is cited there several times by name.

(53) E.g. TZETZES, *Historiae* I, 49 (Cambyses and Mandane), I, 48 (Gyges). Tzetzes draws on material from all the periods and areas covered by Herodotos.

(54) See the account of the flight of Paris and Helen at MAN. 1170-85. E.g. MAN. 1176-9 :

μόλις εἰς ἔν ὠρμίσατο στομάτων τῶν τοῦ Νείλου,
Κανωβικὸν ὀνομασθὲν ἐν χρόνοις τοῖς ὑστέροις,
ἐνθα δεδόμητο νεὼς ἥρωος Ἡρακλέος,
τοῖς πρόσφυξι δωρούμενος ἀνθρώποις ἀσυλίαν.

Cf. HDT. II, 113 : ...ἀπικνέεται... ἐς(τε) τὸ νῦν Κανωβικὸν καλεόμενον στόμα τοῦ Νείλου... Ἡν... Ἡρακλέος ἱρόν, ἐς τὸ ἦν καταφυγὼν οἰκέτης ὅτεο ὦν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβαλήται στίγματα ἱρά, ἐωυτὸν διδοὺς τῷ θεῷ, οὐκ ἔξεστι τούτου ἄψασθαι. MAN. 1186-9, cf. HDT. II, 114 ; MAN. 1190-1204, cf. HDT. II, 115 ; MAN. 1209-21, cf. HDT. II, 118 ; MAN. 1461-6, cf. HDT. II, 119. Man.'s comments at 1112-6, on the seductive inaccuracies of Homer, should perhaps be connected with Herodotos' remarks at II, 116-7 and 120. On the availability of the text of Herodotos, see G. PASQUALI, *Storia della Tradizione e Critica del Testo* (Florence, 1962 ; 2nd ed.), 306-18.

(55) E.g. E. KURTZ, *Viz. Vrem.* 7 (1900), 634 : HDT. I, 7ff ; *Viz. Vrem.* 12 (1906), 81 : HDT. VI, 31 ; 89 : HDT. I, 6 etc.

(56) MAN. 911-6 ; cf. HDT. I, 1.

Herodotos lived. Manasses uses Herodotos for stories from Persian history⁽⁵⁷⁾: the references to Cyrus and Darius, Astyages, Gyges of Lydia that are part of the chronicle tradition are amplified with lurid detail from the *Histories*⁽⁵⁸⁾. Other borrowings occur in the section on the Trojan War. Like Herodotos, Manasses, with ill-concealed scepticism for the poet's veracity, refuses to follow Homer's account⁽⁵⁹⁾. He borrows Herodotos' story of the Egyptian Helen. On no occasion however does Manasses take over any material that deals with the internal affairs of the Greek communities: he rejects the reality of fifth century history for the legendary world of Paris and Helen.

One element that must be partly involved in Manasses' choice of episodes is his evident preference for a good story. After all, to describe the downfall of the Roman kings in terms of the rape of Lucretia (as do Zonaras and Dio Cassius) is more exciting than to discuss Etruscan oppression. This approach would probably have appealed to his patroness. But there are equally good stories in Herodotos on the golden age of the city-states⁽⁶⁰⁾. Manasses has made no use of them.

Here then the paradox of Byzantine attitudes towards the past can be observed in its most acute form. Manasses was writing a survey of world history for a member of the Imperial household. His intention, one must assume, was to deal with those events of the past which had had an important effect on the development of the state he knew. He was writing in Greek with a well-developed

(57) In this, cf. the practice of Zonaras (note 157 *infra*).

(58) Cyrus: MAN. 713-805 (Mandane's dream, rescue of Cyrus by Harpagus, Astyages' vengeance, Cyrus' coming to power), cf. HDT. I, 107-119, 129, 130; Smerdis: MAN. 855-70, cf. HDT. III, 30; Darius (and his horse): MAN. 882-905, cf. HDT. III, 85-6; Gyges: MAN. 813-36, cf. HDT. I, 8-12.

(59) MAN. 1110-6. Manasses' debts in the Trojan section (MAN. 1107-1471) are complex. He has used HDT. II, 113-20 (cf. note 54 *supra*) at MAN. 1106-15, 1174-1221, 1461-6; JOHANNES ANTIOCHENUS (C. MÜLLER, *Fragmenta Historica Graecorum* IV, Paris, 1851), fr. 23 at MAN. 1118-40, fr. 24.3 at MAN. 1357-73 (see too A. HEINRICH, *Die Chronik des Johannes Sikeliota der Wiener Hofbibliothek*, *Jahrb. ersten Staatsgymn. Graz* (1892), 4, 7): there are possible debts to Tzetzes at MAN. 1147, 1284-1353 (see note 48 *supra*). Whether Manasses is using Johannes Antiochenus or Malalas as his basis for the rest of the narrative is hard to say: the former seems the more likely.

(60) E.g. on the fall of the Peisistratids, HDT. V, 55-6.

awareness of the use to be made of the language. He claimed to have worked carefully to reconcile conflicting authorities. Yet he paid no attention to the political history of the Greek lands whose communities had set his linguistic standards. He read Herodotos, but not for his discussions of Greek history : on the contrary, these were rejected in favour of anecdotes about the East. He read some of the historians of Rome who wrote in Greek, and ignored what they had to say about any event in Roman history between the expulsion of the kings and Julius Caesar. How was it that in this work Manasses acquired such mental blinkers, and how did they come to be so firmly fixed ? To begin an answer to this question one must turn to the tradition of chronicle writing on which Manasses drew, and to the fountain-head of that tradition.

Its first extant representative is the chronicle of John Malalas. Malalas compiled the work in the latter part of the sixth century in Antioch, though the writing was possibly completed in Constantinople⁽⁶¹⁾. The chronicle is written in prose, in a simple style which makes little demand on a reader's powers of comprehension. It sheds light on the more popular forms of the language current at the period⁽⁶²⁾ : the audience which Malalas assumed must have been relatively unsophisticated. The chronicle, however, became the most influential example of the genre as well as the earliest to survive in a virtually complete form. Julius Africanus had set the precedent of a history that combined all known areas of the world and which was written with a Christian bias⁽⁶³⁾. In this he was carrying further the example of the historians of the church, who had made a Christian viewpoint acceptable in the writing of history⁽⁶⁴⁾. Eusebius

(61) Bonn ed. (1831), hereafter MAL. ; and also A. SCHENK VON STAUFFENBERG, *Die Römische Kaisergeschichte bei Malalas* (Stuttgart, 1931). See KRUMBACHER, 325-334 ; MORAVCSIK, 329-334 ; G. DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton, 1961), 38.

(62) See A. RÜGER, *Studien zu Malalas : Präpositionen und Adverbien* (Bad Kissingen, 1895) ; K. WOLF, *Studien zur Sprache des Malalas* (Munich, 1911-2) ; K. WEIERHOLT, *Studien zum Sprachgebrauch des Malalas* (Symbolae Osloenses, Fasc. Suppl. 18, 1965) ; R. HELMS, *Die konjunkionalen Nebensätze bei Johannes Malalas und Georgios Sphrantzes in ihrem sprachhistorischen Zusammenhang* (Berlin, 1968).

(63) On Africanus, see the indispensable H. GELZER, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die Byzantinische Chronographie* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1885-1898).

(64) See the essay on Eusebius by A. MOMIGLIANO included in *The Conflict*

continued the process begun by Africanus, by producing his convenient chronological tables, which correlated events occurring in different regions in an easily understood form. Eusebius' influence is inestimable, in both the Greek tradition and in the West, through the work of Jerome⁽⁶⁵⁾. From a modern point of view Malalas' narrative puts a little flesh onto the lost skeleton of Africanus and the bare bones of Eusebius⁽⁶⁶⁾.

A comparison between the contents of Malalas' and Manasses' chronicles is not simple. In the first place Malalas' work proceeds at a more leisurely pace with extensive quotations from some of his sources⁽⁶⁷⁾. Then too he covers much more ground than Manasses attempts⁽⁶⁸⁾. Malalas, for example, devotes a considerable amount of space to Oriental history ; he also goes into great detail over the mythological history of Greece – which, apart from the section on Troy, Manasses omits entirely. Malalas is attempting to present a

between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century (ed. A. Momigliano, London, 1963).

(65) On Eusebius, see e.g. E. SCHWARZ, *RE* 6.1 (1907), cols. 1370-1439 ; D. S. WALLACE-HADRILL, *Eusebius of Caesarea* (London, 1960) ; J. SIRINELLI, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée avant la période prénicéenne* (Dakar, 1961). On Jerome, see J. K. FOTHERINGHAM, *Eusebii Pamphili Chronici Canones* (London, 1923). For the texts, see A. SCHOENE, *Eusebi Chronicorum Libri Duo* (Berlin, 1875 ; reprinted 1967).

(66) Synkellos, of course, is a more trustworthy witness to Africanus' text than Malalas (cf. GELZER, *op. cit.*, II, 176 ff. and the edition of the surviving portions of Africanus in *PG* 10, cols. 63-93).

(67) E.g. Palaiphatos (cf. MAL. 24, 33, 41, 53, 63, 83 etc.) ; Orpheus (MAL. 74) ; Euripides (MAL. 31, 34, 43, 49, 53, 84, 86, 88, 117, 137, 166) ; Dictys of Crete and Sisyphos of Kos (with support from Pheidaios of Corinth) provide most of the narrative for Bk. V.

(68) Thus Bk. I would seem to have dealt with Adam's descendants till the Flood, the division of the earth under Noah's sons, and Assyria ; Bk II covered Egypt, Herakles of Phoenicia, Picus of Italy, Perseus, Kepheus, Thebes and Seruch ; Bk. III : Abraham, Joseph, Persephone, Moses ; Bk. IV : the Argive, Sicyonian and Athenian kings with Jewish comparative chronology, Orpheus, the Argonauts, Thyestes, Bellerophon, Minos, Phaedra ; Bk. V : the Trojan War, Orestes, Jewish history ; Bk. VI : Assyrian history, Nebuchadnezzar and Croesus, Aeneas and Alba Longa ; Bk. VII : foundation of Rome and the kings ; Manlius and the Gauls, Augustus' calendar reforms, Philip of Macedon ; Bk. VIII : Alexander and his successors, Pyrrhus and Hannibal ; Bk. IX : Julius Caesar and Augustus.

comparative chronology in his narrative ; while this is relatively easy both to organize and to assimilate when set out in the form of tables, as in Eusebius' Canons, it is much more difficult when presented as a continuous narrative. Partly as a result of this chronological approach and partly, one suspects, from his own cast of mind, Malalas appears to suffer from a grasshopper mentality as he leaps from one area to another, and from one personality to another, with relatively few absolute dates. Nevertheless his choice of topics foreshadows most of the broad areas which Manasses covers, and tends to share the same omissions.

Thus the introductory material on Oriental history – on, for example, Egypt and Assyria⁽⁶⁹⁾ – is motivated by its connection with Jewish, and thus Biblical history. Manasses used the same arrangement, from the same Christian standpoint. Greek history in Malalas is dealt with by brief lists of kings for a variety of states – Sicyon, Argos, Corinth, Athens, Sparta⁽⁷⁰⁾ – and stories of legendary heroes⁽⁷¹⁾. Manasses ignores not only the lists, which were hardly suitable for a verse chronicle, but also the heroic narratives. Malalas' acknowledgement of the achievements of the city-states is confined to lists of 'famous men', who are strewn intermittently on the narrative with little historical sense and no details : thus, Dracon, Solon, Thales of Miletus and King Aeschylus of Athens are all strung together⁽⁷²⁾. There are none of these lists in Manasses. But Malalas and Manasses both give disproportionately long accounts of the Trojan War⁽⁷³⁾. Both deal, though at different points in their surveys, with Alexander of Macedon. Again Malalas treats Roman history in a series of stories on the founding of the city

(69) Assyria : MAL. (16.20) 150.1-158.6 ; Egypt : MAL. (21.4) 23.1-27.18.

(70) *E.g.* Sicyon : MAL. 68.9 ; Argos : MAL. 68.1, 83.9, 85.13 ; Corinth : MAL. 90.11 ; Athens : MAL. 70.16, 72.11 ; Sparta : MAL. 90.4.

(71) *E.g.* Perseus : MAL. 34.15-38.16 ; Kepheus and Andromeda : MAL. 38.17-39.11 ; Cadmos of Thebes : MAL. 39.12-45.10 ; Dirke : MAL. 45.11-49.17 ; Oidipous : MAL. 49.18-53.14.

(72) MAL. 72.6. Cf. MAL. 161.7 : (in the time of Philip of Macedon) Sophocles, Herakleides, Euripides, Herodotos, Sokrates, Pythagoras ; MAL. 169.7 : Hippasios the Pythagorean, Isocrates, Perikles, Thucydides, Pheidias, Stesichorus, Bacchylides, Demosthenes, Aristophanes.

(73) MAL. 91.1-135.12 (or 143.3 if the Orestes section is included) ; cf. MAN. 1107-1471.

and the early kings⁽⁷⁴⁾, on the Gallic invasions⁽⁷⁵⁾, the Carthaginian Wars⁽⁷⁶⁾, and gives a brief nod towards the consuls and the Republic before launching into an account of Julius Caesar⁽⁷⁷⁾. This cavalier attitude towards Republican Rome is intensified by Manasses. The paradox, therefore, that was observed in Manasses is present, though in a less pronounced form, in Malalas: political history for the city-states of Greece and for Republican Rome is virtually ignored.

But before this question is discussed further, a number of notorious problems which surround the text of Malalas must be briefly considered. In the first place the text itself is elusive. The chief witness is a manuscript of the late eleventh or early twelfth century, *cod. Barocc.* 182, preserved in Oxford. This has lost its opening pages and lacks an ending; there are, too, lacunas in the body of the text⁽⁷⁸⁾. The beginning can be reconstructed, to a certain extent⁽⁷⁹⁾, but the ending has been lost completely⁽⁸⁰⁾. Of the internal lacunas, some can be filled from later excerptors; the portrait list of Greek and Trojan heroes, for example, can be supplemented from Isaac Porphyrogenetos⁽⁸¹⁾; the Constantinian excerpts, *De insidiis* and *De virtutibus*, provide further material⁽⁸²⁾, whose omission from the extant text is not always glaringly apparent. This is not the end of

(74) Aeneas: MAL. 162.9; Romulus: MAL. 171.1; Tarquinius: MAL. 180.20.

(75) MAL. 183.12.

(76) MAL. 209.10.

(77) Consuls: cf. MAL. 187.14 *Μετὰ δὲ τοῦ διοικῆσαι τοὺς ὑπάτους ἔτη πολλὰ πάλιν ἐβασίλευσε πρῶτος Ὀκταβιανὸς Αὐγουστος* (in connection with the naming of the month of February); MAL. 214.1 *Τὰ οὖν Ῥωμαίων πράγματα πρῶτην διωκεῖτο ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπάτων ἐπὶ ἔτη υἱδ' ἕως Καίσαρος Ἰουλίου τοῦ δικτάτορος*.

(78) E.g. after MAL. 103.10 and at MAL. 490.12. See the discussion by L. JEEP, "Die Lücken in der Chronik von Malalas", *RhM* 36 (1881), 351-361.

(79) From *Par. Gr.* 682, ed. V. ISTRIN (as in note 23 *supra*) and A. WIRTH, *Chronographische Späne* (Frankfort, 1894), 1-10 (as Johannes Antiochenus); cf. *Par. Gr.* 1336, ed. J. A. CRAMER, *Anecdota Graeca Parisiensia* II (Oxford, 1839), 231-42.

(80) But see J. B. BURY, "Johannes Malalas: the text of the codex Baroccianus", *BZ* 6 (1897), 221, n. 1, agreeing with NEUMANN (*Hermes* 15, 1880, 356-60) that the copyist has squeezed up the text of the last page.

(81) MAL. 103.10: cf. ISAAC PORPHYROGENNETOS, *Περὶ τῶν καταλειφθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀμήρου* (ed. H. HINCK, *Polemonis Declamationes*, Leipzig, 1873, 57-88).

(82) Ed. C. DE BOOR, *Excerpta de Insidiis* (Berlin, 1905), 159-60 (nos. 14-23), 168 (39), 175-6 (51-2); *De virtutibus* (Berlin, 1906), 161 (no. 7), 162 (12).

the question, however. It is generally agreed that the Oxford codex represents an abbreviation of the original⁽⁸³⁾. If this is the case, then our attitude towards the text must be one of suspicion; are we dealing with a fair representation of the chronicle as written by Malalas, or with a later redaction? The answer to this question will govern, for example, attitudes towards the authors ostensibly quoted by Malalas, for his quotations must sometimes be used to reconstruct otherwise lost works. The evidence for the nature of the surviving text must come from a comparison with the material to be found in the later excerptors⁽⁸⁴⁾. The problem is a complex one and this is not the place to suggest solutions. A detailed study of the

(83) *E.g.* KRUMBACHER, 329; MORAVCSIK, 330.

(84) The Constantinian extracts (already mentioned) show knowledge of a fuller text not to be accounted for by the physical failings of the Oxford manuscript; most passages, however, are identical. Theophanes also sometimes seems to have used a fuller text of Malalas (*e.g.* THEOPH. ed. de Boor, 226: MAL. 484.11). The witness that is physically the earliest, the palimpsest Tusculan fragment, is close to the Oxford Malalas, but with the addition of extra paragraphs (ed. A. MAI, *Spicilegium Romanum* II (Rome, 1839), Appendix; A. ROCCHI, *Codices Cryptenses* (Rome, 1884), 461-2, considers the hand later than the sixth century). The Tusculan fragments confirm in part the *De virtutibus* quotation from Malalas (MAL. 161 = *De virt.* 12). On the other hand, John of Damascus' quotation (PG 94, col. 1369, *De imaginibus* III *περί τῆς αἰμορροῦσης* = MAL. 236.10-239.17) indicates that he was using a text very little different from that extant. The same is true, for example, of many of the extensive quotations to be found in the *Chronicon Paschale*; the order of the material may change substantially, but the content usually varies very little from that of Malalas (*Chron. Pasch.* PG 92, cols 145-9, cf. MAL. 17-20; cols. 150-7, cf. MAL. 34.15-39.11; cols. 157-63, cf. MAL. 28.1-33.10; cols. 289 ff. cf. MAL. 177 ff.). Again the text used by Cedrenos (or Pseudo-Symeon) seems to have been very little different from the Oxford codex. Evidence from translations is also conflicting. The *Chronicon Palatinum*, for example, (ed. Th. MOMMSEN, *Laterculus Imperatorum Romanorum Malalianum* in *MGH Auctores Antiquissimi* 13, *Chronica Minora* 3, 424-37, probably to be dated in the first half of the eighth century and apparently using Malalas for the historical context of the Gospel narrative) gives a version identical to the Oxford codex for the narrative, but incidentally confirms in the list of emperors some of the additions found in the Constantinian excerpts (*ibid.* 436; cf. DE BOOR, *De insidiis*, 159, no. 22). The Slavic version, however, shows many variants, but as the nature of the translation has still to be fully worked out, its witness for the Greek is of mixed value (published piecemeal by V. ISTRIN, 1897-1914; see MORAVCSIK, 331, for references; M. SPINKA and G. DOWNEY, *Chronicle of John Malalas Books VIII-XVIII* (Chicago, 1940), 4-7 discuss the problems and shortcomings of Istrin's edition).

blocks of material quarried from Malalas and a new edition are both vital⁽⁸⁵⁾. Meanwhile it is probably reasonable to assume that the Oxford manuscript does not represent a systematic précis of the original, but that the text has suffered patchily from the vagaries of copyists. It is surprising that a work which had so much subsequent influence should have survived in such a haphazard way : perhaps the enthusiasm with which Malalas' material was absorbed by later compilers discouraged the recopying of the source.

Other problems concern the date of composition, the identity of the author, and the original length of the chronicle. The work at present breaks off in the year 563, but the Oxford manuscript is plainly mutilated. The abrupt change of focus in the last book, from Antioch to Constantinople, also leads to the suspicion that it was tacked on at a later stage of the chronicle's circulation⁽⁸⁶⁾. If not, at the very least, it represents a considerable alternation in the author's outlook. It has been suggested that the author could be the Patriarch John Scholastikos⁽⁸⁷⁾, whose movements and interests correspond quite well with that can be deduced about the otherwise unknown John Malalas. There are also suggestions that traces of Monophysite sympathies exist in the text⁽⁸⁸⁾. All this makes for uncertainty over the exact date of composition.

The remaining major point of discussion in connection with Malalas concerns his sources, and the use he made of them. Unusually for a Byzantine writer, Malalas apparently attributes most of his quotations to their authors by name. In the first nine books he refers to sixty-seven different authorities in an impressive display of ill-assimilated learning. He plainly does not know all these at first hand. On Roman topics, for example, he cites a number of writers who used Latin : Brunichius, Bruttius, Florus, Fortunatus, Licinius, Livy, Lucan, Pliny, Ovid, Sallust, Servius, Suetonius, Vergil. But it is exceedingly doubtful whether he had much

(85) In preparation by K. Weierholt-I. Thurn.

(86) See W. WEBER, "Studien zur Chronik des Malalas", *Festsgabe A. Deissmann* (Tübingen, 1927), 22-66.

(87) J. HAURY, "Johannes Malalas identisch mit Patriarchen Johannes Scholasticus ?", *BZ* 9 (1900), 337-56.

(88) E.g. E. PATZIG, "Der angebliche Monophysitismus des Malalas", *BZ* 7 (1898), 111-128 ; E. GLEYE, "Über Monophysitische Spuren im Malalaswerke", *BZ* 8 (1899), 312-27.

acquaintance with Latin literature, or could even read Latin. Eutropius, for instance, is cited specifically from the Greek translation; Cicero is classed as a poet, as is Sallust, who is simultaneously treated as a respectable historian; Malalas has no idea when Vergil wrote⁽⁸⁹⁾. The statements attributed to them must have been available to him through some secondary collection of material. It is thus all the more likely that much of Malalas' knowledge of other authorities came to him second-hand. It has been suggested that he used only four basic sources, at least in the first fourteen books⁽⁹⁰⁾: Domninos, Timotheos, Nestorinos and an unnamed source. As these are all now lost the hypothesis cannot be satisfactorily verified, particularly in view of the inadequacy of our text of Malalas. It is probably too extravagant a position, though, for example, it is undeniable that the citations from Pausanias are derived through Domninos⁽⁹¹⁾. Groups of quotations found in Malalas have also been observed elsewhere in circumstances suggesting a common source rather than direct contact⁽⁹²⁾. When references can be checked, they are often accurate, though this does not, of course, rule out an intermediary. In one case at least, that of Dictys, a summary of whose romance is intermingled with that of Sisypchos of Kos (now lost)⁽⁹³⁾, Malalas' version has been vindicated by papyri as a fair representation of the lost Greek original, known otherwise only in Latin⁽⁹⁴⁾. Here, and with the quotations from

(89) E.g. MAL. 209.6: *Εὐτρόπιος ὁ συγγραφεὺς Ῥωμαίων ἐν τῇ μεταφράσει αὐτοῦ*; MAL. 212.18-19: *Ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς οὖν χρόνοις ἦν ὁ Κικέρων καὶ ὁ Σαλλούστιος, οἱ σοφώτατοι Ῥωμαίων ποιηταί* (cf. ref. to Sallust, MAL. 209.2); MAL. 216.3: Vergil is dated to the dictatorship of Julius Caesar (MAL. 162.9-13: *Aeneid* IV is inaccurately summarized).

(90) H. BOURRIER, *Über die Quellen der ersten vierzehn Bücher des Johannes Malalas*, AbhSt. Stephan Gymnasium (Augsburg, 1899).

(91) H. BOURRIER, *op. cit.*, 9 ff.; cf. A. DILLER, "The Authors named Pausanias", *TAPA* 86 (1955), 268-79.

(92) J. BIDEZ, "Sur diverses citations et notamment sur trois passages de Malalas retrouvés dans un texte hagiographique", *BZ* 11 (1902), 288-94; S. CONSTANZA, "Sull'utilizzazione di alcune citazioni teologiche nella cosmografia di Giovanni Malala e in due testi agiografici", *BZ* 52 (1959), 247-52.

(93) E. PATZIG, "Das Trojabuch des Sisypchos von Kos", *BZ* 12 (1903), 231-57.

(94) E. PATZIG, "Das griechische Dictysfragment", *BZ* 17 (1908), 382-8; W. EISENHUT, *Dictys Cretensis: Bellum Troianum* (Leipzig, 1973; 2nd ed.), 134-9 and *idem*, "Zum neueren Diktys-Papyrus", *RhM* N.F. 112 (1969), 114-9.

Euripides, for instance ⁽⁹⁵⁾, it seems an unnecessary complication to deny that Malalas had access to the texts themselves. Once again the question needs a thorough re-examination, one result of which would be a fuller understanding of the literary resources of sixth century Antioch ⁽⁹⁶⁾.

There are two methods of treatment to be observed in Malalas' chronicle. The narratives, which are of varying lengths and are often ascribed to an authority, contrast with staccato items of information (lists of rulers or famous men, for example). The latter should perhaps be attributed to the chronological source on which Malalas was drawing; in many instances it looks as though Malalas had collected together in one haphazard paragraph names that were spread over several columns of a chronographer ⁽⁹⁷⁾, thus presenting a misleading series of statements. The former, the narratives, seem to be inspired by a variety of motives not unconnected with Malalas' own personality and tastes. Between the narrative sections, however, can be perceived the chronological framework which must ultimately depend on the work of Eusebius and Africanus ⁽⁹⁸⁾, that is, an attempt to correlate Jewish history with Greek ⁽⁹⁹⁾.

(95) MAL. 136.9-139.4 : cf. *Iphigeneia in Tauris* 69-70, 238-60, 759-82 (though the recognition tokens are reported incorrectly).

(96) Cf. E. BICKERMANN, "Les Maccabées de Malalas", *Byzantion* 21 (1951), 63-88.

(97) Cf. MAL. 72.6 ff. Inserted into the partial Athenian king-list (MAL. 71.23 *Κέκροψ*... *Κραναός*... *Φωρωνεύς*, και ἄλλοι ἕως *Κοδρῶνος*, cf. *Χρονογραφείον Σύντομον* ed. E. SCHOENE, *Eusebi Chronicorum Libri duo* (Berlin, 1875), I, App. II, col. 87) are references to Draco and the law-making of Solon (cf. JEROME, *ibid.*, 91, Anno Abrahamis 1395; 93, A.A. 1425) and Thales of Miletus as law-giver rather than philosopher (cf. JEROME, *ibid.*, 81, A.A. 1269; 89, A.A. 1376); the king-list is resumed with Aeschylus, Akmaion, Arexion (cf. *Χρον. Σύν.*, *loc. cit.*). A drama on Akmaion is attributed to Euripides. The whole farrago is ascribed to Africanus.

(98) Both are cited. Eusebius, e.g. MAL. 53.17 (Seruch); 57.9 (Tharra); 70.9 (Deucalion); 150.11 (Nebuchadnezzar); 190.19 (Kings of Macedon); 197.16 (Ptolemies); 207.15 (second capture of Jerusalem) and in *Par. Gr.* 682 (ed. Istrin as in note 23 *supra*), 5, I (list of sources), 9, X (ark on Ararat), 11, XII (lands inhabited by Noah's sons); the first three references seem to be false. Africanus, e.g. MAL. 53.14 (Theban kings); 62.6 (Ogyges' flood); 69.3 (Kings of Sicily); 72.14 (Kings of Athens); 90.7 (Kings of Sparta); 90.16 (first Olympic games) and in *Par. Gr.* 682, 5, I (list of sources). See H. GELZER, *Sextus Julius Africanus*, 129-138 for the accuracy of these citations.

(99) Cf. J. SIRINELLI, *op. cit.* (as in note 65 *supra*), 112.

However great Malalas' debt to his sources, he has, even if only through the act of selection, imposed his own attitudes on his borrowings. From the content of the chronicle one can develop an opinion on the author's interests ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾.

Thus, like all Byzantine chroniclers, he is Christian ; he uses a chronology from Adam, he emphasizes Jewish history and includes the narrative of Christ's life. His Christian background moulds his interest in the history of Egypt, Assyria and Persia, for Egypt is connected with the migrations of the Jews, Assyria with invasions and exiles. The use Malalas makes of the *Book of Daniel* shows how the process can work. Since the prophecies it contained were capable of constant re-interpretation, *Daniel* became an important vehicle for prophecy and eschatological speculation ⁽¹⁰¹⁾. As the rebuilding of the Temple became important for Christian allegory on the New Temple and the New Jerusalem, so the connection of *Daniel* with the rebuilding of the Old Jerusalem enhanced its relevance. Malalas devotes considerable space to the narrative based on *Daniel*, and to the figures connected with it : Nebuchadnezzar, Darius, Cyrus. He introduces Alexander of Macedon in this connection, as the destroyer of Darius' kingdom.

Malalas' Christianity has also formed his attitude towards Greek mythology. He uses the stories in which the ancient gods appear, but not once does he describe an Olympian deity as a divine being. The gods' names are used, attached to figures who are rationalized into mortals and usually of royal descent. Thus, for example, Zeus has become Picus ; he, his son and his wife have been woven into the structure of Assyrian and Italian history ⁽¹⁰²⁾. This demythologizing

(100) Cf. Z. V. UDAL' COVA, "La chronique de Jean Malalas dans la Russie de Kiev", *Byzantion* 35 (1965), 575-591 ; *eadem*, "Mirovozzrenie vizantijskogo chronista Joanna Malaly", *Viz. Vrem.* 32 (1971), 3-23.

(101) Cf. JEROME, *Commentarium in Daniele*, PL 25, cols. 513-610 ; CHRYSOSTOM, PG 56, cols. 193-246 ; THEODORETUS OF CYR, PG 81, cols. 1256-1549. See R. DEVRESSE, "Chaines exégétiques", in *Dictionnaire de la Bible* (Paris, 1895 ff.), Suppl. I, 1084-1123 ; H. H. ROWLEY, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Cardiff, 1935) ; M. DELCOR, *Le Livre de Daniel* (Paris, 1971) ; L. RYDEN, "The Andreas Salos Apocalypse : Greek text, translation and commentary", *DOP* 28 (1974), 197-261.

(102) *Par. Gr.* 682 (ed. Istrin as in note 23 *supra*), 12, XV ff.

process dates back at least to Xenophanes of Colophon⁽¹⁰³⁾, though the authority Malalas cites for most of such views is Palaiphatos⁽¹⁰⁴⁾. The important fact, however, is that Malalas' rationalizing attitude has affected all the Greek legendary history that he retells. He chooses sources that avoid the intervention of the Olympian deities in any action that demands the miraculous. Even so, while the Judgement of Paris, for example, is carefully explained away in allegorical terms that deny the existence of the goddesses⁽¹⁰⁵⁾, the implication is that his readers will be well aware of that version of the story.

Though frequently he confines himself to a hasty note of an event or a few names, Malalas is prepared to recount some portions of Greek legendary history at length. The Trojan War is the most conspicuous example, but he also writes fully on the Theban legends, on Orestes of Argos, on Perseus, Orpheus and Bellerophon⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. This fullness is in marked contrast to the brevity of the lists of famous historical figures, and one is led to speculate on possible reasons for the different treatments. It is in fact striking that the majority of the stories are connected with the more famous works of Greek verse literature that were likely to be read in the course of a standard education⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. Thus the section on Troy amplifies – as well as corrects – Homer. The material on Perseus and Bellerophon was

(103) See F. BUFFIÈRE, *Les Mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque* (Paris, 1956 ; reprinted, 1973).

(104) E.g. MAL. 24.17 (Ares and Aphrodite); 33.9 (purple cloth); 41.18 (Semele); 53.11 (Oidipous); 63.2 (Persephone); 83.4 (parentage of Helen); 209.7 (Perseus of Epirus). For Palaiphatos, see N. FESTA, *Palaephati Περὶ ἀπίστων* (Leipzig, 1902).

(105) MAL. 92.12-93.3.

(106) Troy : MAL. 91-133.2 ; Thebes : MAL. 39.12-53.14 ; Orestes : MAL. 133.3-143.3 ; Perseus : MAL. 34.15-39.11 ; Orpheus : MAL. 72.16-76.9 ; Bellerophon : MAL. 83.9-84.17.

(107) Cf. G. BUCKLER, "Byzantine Education", in *Byzantium : an Introduction to East Roman Civilization* (ed. N. Baynes and H.St.L.B. Moss, Oxford, 1948), 200-220 ; R. BROWNING, "Byzantinische Schulen und Schulmeister", *Das Altertum* 9 (1963), 105 ff. ; M. L. CLARKE, *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (London, 1971) ; P. LEMERLE, *Le Premier Humanisme Byzantin* (Paris, 1971), 242-266 ; P. SPECK, *Die Kaiserliche Universität von Konstantinopel* (Byz. Archiv 14, Munich, 1974).

dealt with in plays by Euripides⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. The contents of the section on the legends of Thebes are drawn from Sophocles⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ as well as Euripides. The one figure who does not fit so well into this pattern is Orpheus, in connection with whom Malalas quotes liberal quantities of verse; Malalas is perhaps here acknowledging Orpheus as the prophet and symbol of Christ rather than as a literary figure⁽¹¹⁰⁾. This apart, he seems to be recognizing those Greek legends which had the greatest literary circulation. He is aware of the distinction between the outlook and methods of a historian and a poet, for he often draws attention to the nature of the source he follows⁽¹¹¹⁾. Nonetheless he as frequently gives the poetic version of the story in question⁽¹¹²⁾. This attitude is not dissimilar to that observed in his treatment of the pagan gods, where he seems to be rejecting the subject of his narrative. One may contrast his discursiveness in mythological stories with his references to Thucydides, who is but one name in a list, followed by a brief comment on the subject of his history⁽¹¹³⁾.

The reasons for another part of his narrative are much more obvious. The Christian chronology may be the constant frame-

(108) For a discussion of the lost plays, see T. B. L. WEBSTER, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London, 1967): e.g. *Stheneboia*, 80-4; *Danae*, 94-5; *Bellerophon*, 109-111. For the transmission and availability of the plays, see W. S. BARRETT, *Euripides Hippolytus* (Oxford, 1964), 50-3, discussing Wilamowitz' views on the selection of plays in later antiquity (*Analecta Euripidea*, 1875, 137-43). Cf. G. ZUNTZ, *An enquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965), 249 ff.

(109) Though not particularly accurately; cf. MAL. 40.12 on Tiresias according to Sophocles; MAL. 49.17-53.14 on Oidipous, with a debt to Sophocles, though the passage is ascribed to Palaiphatos, Euripides and Africanus.

(110) On the Orphic poetry, see K. ZIEGLER, *Orphische Dichtung*, *RE* 18.2 (1942), cols. 1321-1417; ed. O. KERN, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (Zurich, 1922; reprinted, 1972). On Orpheus as Christ symbol, cf. K. ZIEGLER, *Orpheus*, *RE* 18.2 (1942), cols. 1313-6; H. LECLERQ, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, 12.2 (1936), cols. 2735-55.

(111) Cf. MAL. 30.16 τὴν δὲ Εὐρώπην οἱ ποιηταὶ ἐξέθεντο θυγατέρα εἶναι τοῦ Φοίνικος... μὴ ὁμοφωνήσαντες τοῖς χρονογράφοις.

(112) E.g. in connection with Homer, MAL. 24.14 (Ares and Aphrodite); MAL. 119.23 (Kirke).

(113) MAL. 169.10 καὶ Θουκυδίδης ὁ συγγραψάμενος τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων.

work⁽¹¹⁴⁾ but plainly the chief purpose of the narrative is secular, to explain how the political circumstances of Malalas and his fellow-citizens developed. The Chronicle for about half its length deals with Rome of the Principate and the Empire⁽¹¹⁵⁾. Writing under Justinian, who was attempting to make good his claims to the former imperial territories of Western Europe⁽¹¹⁶⁾, Malalas would have had his attention drawn to the central role of Rome as the predecessor of Constantinople.

He would also have viewed this Empire as an inhabitant of one of its great cities. Malalas is an Antiochene who brings Antioch into the narrative on every possible occasion, and on some unlikely ones too. He includes material simply for its references to Antioch, or for its explanations of local features. Thus the story of Io is dealt with because it provides a foundation legend for Antioch⁽¹¹⁷⁾. The story of Iphigeneia and Orestes, taken largely from Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, is also part of local history⁽¹¹⁸⁾. A reference to an otherwise unremarkable statue and altar is justified with the comment that it could still be seen in his day⁽¹¹⁹⁾. Malalas would seem to feel considerable pride in both the appearance and the history of the city with which he was connected⁽¹²⁰⁾.

Here then can be seen four aspects of Malalas' mental background which have affected the structure and content of his chronicle : he is a Christian from the Graeco-Roman city of Antioch. Whatever his Syrian connections⁽¹²¹⁾ they seem to have been swamped by the

(114) With the Life of Christ as a major fixed point ; cf. MAL. 227.1-229.12 ; 229.17-231.11 ; 240.3-242.7.

(115) MAL. 214-496 (Bks IX-XVIII).

(116) See, e.g., B. RUBIN, *Das Zeitalter Justinians* (Berlin, 1960), 122 ff.

(117) MAL. 28.5-30.3 : Io fled εἰς τὸ Σίλπιον ὄρος· εἰς ὅπερ Σέλευκος ὁ Νικάτωρ ὁ Μακεδὼν ἔκτισε πόλιν μετὰ χρόνους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἰδίου αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ Ἀντιόχειαν τὴν μεγάλην (28.22-29.2) ; the story of Io accounts for several buildings as well as Antiochene customs.

(118) MAL. 140.19-142.20 : Orestes' wanderings end at τὸ Σίλπιον ὄρος, accounting en route for the foundation of Scythopolis.

(119) MAL. 139.20-21 ; cf. the statue of Orestes discussed at MAL. 141.21.

(120) E.g. MAL. 232.6 ; 243.10 ; 246.13 ; 260.2 ; 267.15 etc., on the building record of each Emperor. Cf., e.g., G. DOWNEY, "The Wall of Theodosius at Antioch", *AJP* 62 (1941), 207-13.

(121) Cf. J. HAURY, "Johannes Malalas...", (as in note 87 *supra*).

greater cultural force of Graeco-Roman society. In his preferences for personalities rather than abstractions, anecdotes rather than constitutional analyses, and his pedantic insistence on his authorities, one can perhaps discern the man's own personality: a fussy gossip with a liking for the tangible. It is ironical that he was to exercise greater influence over popular levels of Byzantine historical belief than any of the more competent and learned men who preceded and succeeded him. But all this can go some way toward explaining the imbalance of his material that was noted earlier – the virtual omission of any discussion of the Greek city states and Republican Rome.

For Malalas the reality of the Imperial might must have made meaningless any state which operated at less than an imperial level. Even though he lived in a major city with a tradition of independence⁽¹²²⁾, Malalas perhaps could not visualize that city functioning as an independent unit. Athens and Sparta would be too small, their elected magistracies too alien to make any impact on his historical imagination. But this is not the whole reason: it is not only the scale of imperial power that is important, it is the fact of monarchy. In spite of his general neglect of the political history of Greece, Malalas does include lists of the kings who ruled in each state but abandons separate references for that state on the institution of democratic forms of government⁽¹²³⁾. It is impossible to tell how far this represents a conscious choice or simply reflects his sources. Eusebius' Canons, to which Malalas is ultimately indebted, listed out the kings of the Greek city-states – from Sicyon on to Athens – but made no mention of the democratic magistracies that followed. With the end of the kings comes an end to the independent listing of that state⁽¹²⁴⁾. Malalas follows the same

(122) G. DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton, 1961); J. H. W. G. LIEBESCHUTZ, *Antioch: city and imperial administration in the later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1972).

(123) See note 70 *supra*.

(124) Though the notes that accompanied the tables refer to events, statesmen, writers, philosophers etc. from the later periods. Eusebius however comments (I.3: from the Armenian version): "De Graecorum ab omnibus longis temporibus exclusione non est quod mireris, qui variis exitiosis corruptelis semetipsos injecerunt, et longo tempore usque ad Cadmi gentem litteris prosus caruerunt". His feelings about the Greek past were ambivalent.

practice. Either none of his other sources supplemented this information, or he felt no need to seek it out.

Many of the same factors must have operated to remove almost all reference to the Roman Republic. Malalas discusses the founding of the city and its first kings, but has virtually nothing to say about the consular period until Julius Caesar reintroduced the monarchy⁽¹²⁵⁾. He cannot have lacked possible sources, either in full or in excerpted form⁽¹²⁶⁾. Eusebius' Canons did after all list the consuls, and could have provided a framework for such additional material as might be felt necessary. But Malalas seems to have seen no need to supplement or even record this information, if it reached him : the annual magistracies and the activities of the growing city-state under their control had no relevance for him.

One can perhaps see now why Malalas should choose to treat the Trojan War at such length. The material he covers here answers to several of his interests. It deals with a portion of Greek legendary history which is the subject of the most widely read Greek authors, Homer. The Greek communities are shown engaged in a major undertaking of aggressive imperialism under royal leaders. From this conflict emerges Aeneas, the founder of the future city of Rome. This network of stories then represents the link in legend between the two halves of Malalas' Graeco-Roman world, between the Greek world of literature and the Roman world of political reality.

Enough has now been said to demonstrate that despite the differences of scale in their work and the different milieux in which they lived, Malalas and Manasses share certain attitudes towards world history. This does not appear to be because Manasses was drawing directly on Malalas. Tzetzes indeed knew and used Malalas' Chronicle : he cites it as *Ἰωάννης Ἀντιοχεύς* as well as *Ἰωάννης Μαλέλας*⁽¹²⁷⁾. But although Tzetzes' literary researches seem to have influenced Manasses at some points in his selection of material⁽¹²⁸⁾,

(125) See notes 74-7.

(126) He is aware, for example, of at least the names of Livy, Lucan and Plutarch and has an idea of the material they covered.

(127) *Historiae* I, 321 ; II, 37 ; V, 835 ; VI, 576 ; *Allegories on the Iliad*, Prolegomena 246 *ὡς Ἰωάννης χρονικός Ἀντιοχεύς που γράφει* ; Schol. ad loc. *τοῦ ἐπίκλην ὁ Μαλέλας*. Cf. E. PATZIG, "Malalas und Tzetzes", (as in note 49 *supra*).

(128) See notes 46 and 48 *supra*.

Manasses does not seem to have been inspired to go directly to the earlier chronicle. There is, for example, no trace in the *Σύνοψις Χρονική* of some of the distinctive mythological material of the sort which Tzetzes took over from Malalas⁽¹²⁹⁾.

There were, however, a host of intermediaries through whom both the material included by Malalas and the emphases he gave it came through to the twelfth century. Malalas' text was quarried by generations of subsequent chroniclers, who came seeking material for some very different structures. Some took only occasional bricks to build into their edifices, others borrowed the entire ground plan. Among the former were Evagrius⁽¹³⁰⁾ and Theophanes⁽¹³¹⁾, neither of whom were writing chronicles from the Creation. They used Malalas as one of a number of sources for their respective works, and so were not much influenced by his selection or omission of material.

The author of the final form of the *Chronicon Paschale*⁽¹³²⁾, however, worked in dimensions similar to those of Malalas. He seems to have been particularly concerned to correlate the history of the Old and the New Testament with a secular chronological framework. His methods of computation are complex⁽¹³³⁾. One result has been to retain the dating system of Olympiads, consul lists and indictions while at the same time using the Christian concept of dating from the Creation. The author has drawn on a variety of sources, both for the chronological data and the narratives which

(129) E.g. on Theban legendary history (MAL. 45, TZETZES, *Historiae* I, 319 ff.) ; on Dionysius (MAL. 43, TZETZES, *Historiae* VI, 556 ff.). Manasses' version of the Judgement of Paris, for example, which is indebted to Tzetzes' researches, does not include the hymn which is a prominent feature of Malalas' account (even though it appears in Tzetzes' *Allegories*). But cf. MAL. 214.2, MAN. 1757-8 where both agree that consular rule in Rome lasted 464 years.

(130) Born 536 : MORAVCSIK, 257-9 ; KRUMBACHER, 245-7. Ed. J. BIDEZ and L. PARMENTIER, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius*, (London, 1898).

(131) Died 818 : MORAVCSIK, 531-7 ; KRUMBACHER, 342-7. Ed. C. DE BOOR, *Theophanis Chronographia* (Leipzig, 1883-5). Most recently on the date of composition, see C. MANGO and I. ŠEVČENKO, "Some Churches and Monasteries on the Southern Shore of the Sea of Marmara", *DOP* 27 (1973), 264-5.

(132) Final version compiled c. 628 : MORAVCSIK, 241-3 ; KRUMBACHER, 337-9. Ed. Bonn (1832).

(133) See V. GRUMEL, *Traité d'Études Byzantines I : La Chronographie* (Paris, 1958).

give them substance. Among these is Malalas, who has been consulted for the legendary history of Greece and Rome⁽¹³⁴⁾. As in Malalas, some of the famous Greek names from the period of the city-states are retained, here scattered under Olympiads. No narrative has been added to amplify the references⁽¹³⁵⁾. The exception, as always, is for Alexander the Great and the successors to his Empire, where a little explanatory material was included. Roman consuls – not listed by Malalas – are here given similar treatment to the prominent Greek names; narrative is only added with the appearance of Julius Caesar⁽¹³⁶⁾. Thus this author too finds it difficult to envisage a state without a monarch.

Johannes Antiochenus, on the other hand, seems to have taken over not only Malalas' scale but also the plan of his history, so far as can be judged from the surviving portions of his work⁽¹³⁷⁾. Both Greek and Roman legendary history have been retained and even amplified⁽¹³⁸⁾, especially passages dealing with the Roman kings. Because of the fragmentary nature of the work it is rash to make assumptions about what might have been omitted, but in all likelihood Johannes Antiochenus did not deviate from the overall pattern of Malalas' Chronicle. Indeed the two writers have been confused⁽¹³⁹⁾.

(134) *E.g. Chron. Pasch.* 68, cf. *MAL.* 34; Picus Zeus and Danae; *Chron Pasch.* 204-213, cf. *MAL.* 171-80; Romulus and the founding of Rome.

(135) *E.g. Chron. Pasch.* 214: death of Thales of Miletus; 267: Simonides, Chilon of Sparta, Pythagoras, Xenophanes of Colophon, Croesus and Gyges, Thales of Miletus again.

(136) Alexander: *Chron. Pasch.* 319, 321, 326; Julius Caesar: *Chron. Pasch.* 354 ff.

(137) Early 7th century: MORAVCSIK, 313-5. The Constantinian Fragments (edd. C. DE BOOR, Th. BÜTTNER-WOBST, etc. *Constantini Porphyrogeneti Excerpta Historica* (Berlin, 1905 ff.) and the Salmasian Fragments (ed. J. A. CRAMER, *Anecdota Graeca Parisiensia* (Oxford, 1840), II, 383-401): their interrelationship and the accuracy with which they represent the original are discussed by *e.g.*, E. PATZIG, "Die *ἑτερα ἀρχαιολογία* des Excerpta Salmasiana", *BZ* 9 (1900), 357-69.

(138) *E.g.* Orestes: *De insidiis* § 3, cf. *MAL.* 133 ff. But comparison is difficult: Malalas' text is abbreviated and Johannes Antiochenus survives only in excerpts.

(139) See E. PATZIG, "Johannes Antiochenus und Johannes Malalas" (as in note 21 *supra*); *idem*, "Die Abhängigkeit des Johannes Antiochenus von Johannes Malalas", *BZ* 10 (1901), 40-52.

Other writers who incorporated material from Malalas into their own chronicles were Bishop John of Nikiu ⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ and the anonymous compiler of the *'Εκλογή Ἱστοριῶν* ⁽¹⁴¹⁾. The former, though he used Greek, was writing in Egypt ; he had no impact on the later stages of the tradition. The latter is another link in the chain which handed on Malalas' material, especially in the mythological portions. Neither did anything to remedy the imbalances that existed in their sources, whether Malalas himself or those under his influence.

A more sophisticated approach may be observed in the work of George Synkellos, friend of the Patriarch Tarasios ⁽¹⁴²⁾. It was his unfinished chronicle which Theophanes took up and continued. Synkellos' reading was extensive, as his citations indicate. Many derive from authors no longer fully extant and enhance the value of his work ⁽¹⁴³⁾. His attention, however, was focussed on ecclesiastical history and theology rather than on secular history. Thus he rejects material on the legendary history of Greece and Rome in favour of detailed treatment of biblical history. Synkellos was particularly concerned with the establishment of an accurate chronology ; hence, although he quotes extensively from some authorities on questions of dating, he adds very little narrative to the bare facts he has collected ⁽¹⁴⁴⁾. He has returned, however, to Eusebius and Africanus, who bear considerable responsibility for Malalas' emphasis on kings and empires and his inability to record in any detail the history of non-monarchical periods. Thus it is not surprising to find in Synkellos' more thoughtful work omissions similar to those observed in Malalas.

(140) Late 7th century : KRUMBACHER, 395. Ed. H. ZOTENBERG, *Notices et Extraits* 24 (1883), 125-605.

(141) KRUMBACHER, 395. Ed. J. A. CRAMER, *Anecdota Parisiensia* (Oxford, 1840), II, 166-230.

(142) Died c. 810 ; KRUMBACHER, 339-42 ; Bonn ed. (1829).

(143) Synkellos is especially useful for what he preserves of Eusebius' *Chronicon* and Africanus ; cf. H. GELZER, *Sextus Julius Africanus* II, 176-249 ; LAQUEUR, *RE* 4.2 (1932), cols. 1388-1410.

(144) Thus most of the material on legendary history is collected into short sections entitled *Σποράδην* (e.g. 236, 289 etc.), with king lists set out separately. On the other hand, the Trojan War, which was an important point in the chronologies of all previous writers, is discussed carefully (e.g. 295, 309, 314, 317 ; at 320 is a survey of the events that caused the fighting ; cf. 325).

In the Chronicle of George Monachos ⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ one sees a similar but less reasoned narrowing of focus from Malalas' wider perspectives. The writer's interests are concentrated on biblical history, and, for the secular past, on the Roman Empire after the appearance of Julius Caesar. The Greek and Roman legends are represented by summaries based on Malalas, a preliminary as it were to the real subject ⁽¹⁴⁶⁾. Thus, for the early history of Greece there are, as mentioned earlier, scraps dealing with Picus Zeus and the naming of the planets; Alexander of Macedon is included ⁽¹⁴⁷⁾, though there is nothing on the Trojan War. For Roman history, the founding of the city, the activities of Romulus and Remus and the institution of the Brumalia are mentioned ⁽¹⁴⁸⁾; but then there is nothing more until the appearance of Julius Caesar ⁽¹⁴⁹⁾. George Monachos does in fact make explicit his reluctance to deal with things Greek ⁽¹⁵⁰⁾: he shows a monastic suspicion of everything pagan.

George Cedrenos' Compendium ⁽¹⁵¹⁾, for these early sections at least, appears to be based almost exclusively on the unpublished chronicle of Pseudo-Symeon. This, drawing as it does on many sources, makes extensive use of Malalas' material on ancient history. Sections are found, for example, on Ninus, Sardanapalus, Troy, Alexander and the foundation of Rome ⁽¹⁵²⁾. Nothing, however, has

(145) Second half of 9th century: MORAVCSIK, 277-80; KRUMBACHER, 352-8. Ed. as in note 23 *supra* and PG 110.

(146) He treats secular history in BK. I only; the method is stated in the Proemium (GEORGE MON. 4, 3-4): 'Ἀπὸ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Ἀδάμ ἀρξάμενοι καὶ μέχρι τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτῆς ἐλθόντες ἐν συντόμῳ, πάλιν ἀνάπαλιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ...

(147) GEORGE MON. 25-43.

(148) GEORGE MON. 21-23.

(149) GEORGE MON. 293: τὰ δὲ Ῥωμαίων πράγματα ἐδιωκείτο πρῶτην ὑπὸ ὑπάτων ἐπὶ ἔτη τξδ' ἕως Ἰουλίου Καίσαρος.

(150) E.g. GEORGE MON. 61, 12-16: *Εἴτα τοίνυν καὶ οἱ τῶν τοιοῦτων ψευδοθέων κήρυκες καὶ μάντιες ποιηταὶ τε καὶ συγγραφεῖς οὐχ ἀπλῶς εἶναι θεοὺς μόνον ἔγραψαν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν πρὸς ἐλεγχόν τε ἀθεότητος καὶ αἰσχροποιοῦ πολιτείας ἀνέγραψαν.* See GEORGE MON. 57-92; his discussion ends: *Τοσαύτη γοῦν πάλαι πλάνη κατεῖχε τὸν κόσμον· ἀλλὰ ταύτην ἄρδην ἠφάνισε καὶ ἀμπαν ἐξήλασε προδήλως ὁ παρ' ἡμῶν προσκυνούμενος Κύριος.*

(151) Late 11th century; MORAVCSIK, 273-5; on Pseudo-Symeon (*Par. Gr.* 1712) as a source for Cedrenos, see K. PRAECHTER, *Quellenkritische Studien* (as in note 28 *supra*), and A. MARKOPOULOS (as in note 6 *supra*).

(152) Cf. notes 23-26 *supra*.

been added to deal with the intervening periods ; the structure of the past is still for Cedrenos and Pseudo-Symeon essentially what it had been for Malalas.

The examples given so far indicate how little was the independence of outlook shown by the writers in the chronicle tradition. One major group of chroniclers nevertheless stands outside the material derived from Malalas. In the nexus of the Logothete chronicles can be traced the remnants of two recensions of an epitome of world history that dates back to the Justinianic period ⁽¹⁵³⁾. This distinct tradition does nothing to fill the gaps that have been noted in accounts deriving from Malalas. The main emphasis for the early period is on the Bible ⁽¹⁵⁴⁾. References to the legendary past of Greece and Rome, to the Greek city-states and Rome of the Republic are scanty and brief ⁽¹⁵⁵⁾.

Thus the early sections of the chroniclers – whether derived from Malalas or not – show few significant changes from a fairly uniform basic pattern. Periods and states which were omitted or treated sketchily by Malalas are rarely given fuller discussion by his successors. But significant changes in detail may be observed. The Greek nuances which were originally present to modify the Roman picture gradually fade. The purpose of these introductory sections was to lead up to the history of the Roman Empire, now established at Constantinople. Already for Malalas the Greek element of the Byzantine heritage is subordinate to the Roman. The subordination is increasingly simplified into a rejection.

In Zonaras' historical writings one can see the logical outcome of his pattern. He had plainly explored with some care the literary

(153) Cf. A. SERRUYS, *op. cit.*, as in note 6 *supra*.

(154) E.g. Leo Grammaticus (ed. Bonn, 1842), 1-24 deals with biblical history, with passing references to the naming of the planets (11) and Picus Zeus (15) ; 25 refers to Inachos and Phoroneus of Argos, the flood under Ogyges, and Picus Zeus of Assyria before returning to a narrative dealing with Joshua. Cf. JULIUS POLLUX (ed. J. Hardt, Leipzig, 1792) 1-102 on biblical history ; THEODOSIOS MELITENOS (ed. T. L. F. TAFEL, *Monumenta Saecularia* III, Munich, 1859), 1-25.

(155) E.g. LEO GRAMMATICUS 28 : Kekrops of Attika, Kadmos of Thebes (and Tiresias) ; 36 : Thales of Miletus and the Erythraian Sibyl ; 48 : Plato and Aristotle ; 35 : a reference to the birth of Romulus and Remus leads on to the aristocracy and consuls who preceded Julius Caesar (cf. MELITENOS, 31) ; 49 : with Alexander of Macedon and his successors the narrative becomes fuller.

resources available to him ⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. He makes use, for example, of Dio Cassius and Plutarch, who deal largely with Roman matters. He also uses Herodotes and Xenophon who concentrate on Greek affairs ⁽¹⁵⁷⁾. But Zonaras has looked afresh at the history of the state in which he lived. For him Greek history has become completely irrelevant. The only features of Byzantine civilization that emerge from his account are its Christian character and its Roman past : the information which he provides concentrates on biblical history and the Roman Emperors ⁽¹⁵⁸⁾. The exclusion of the Greek element – again despite the language that both he and his sources employ – goes so far as to remove all discussion of the Trojan War. Aeneas, a Trojan refugee from the Greek world, is nevertheless still the founder of Alba Longa and thus ultimately of the city of Rome ⁽¹⁵⁹⁾.

So we return to the attitudes observed in Manasses' Chronicle, one of the last links in the chain that stretches back to Malalas ⁽¹⁶⁰⁾.

(156) Cf. the material recorded by the contents of his *Lexicon*, ed. J. A. H. TITTMAN (Leipzig, 1808).

(157) For Plutarch and Dio Cassius see notes 42-5 *supra*. Xenophon : e.g. *Annals* III, 15-26 on Cyrus : Herodotos : *Annals* IV, 1-4 on Cyrus and Persian history.

(158) See the Preface to the *Annals* (I, 9-15) : Alexander the Great is included chiefly because of the chronological connection with the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem.

(159) *Annals* VII : Zonaras gives his account of the origins of Rome only after dealing with Jewish history until the sack of Jerusalem under Titus – by which time the narrative is inextricably involved with Roman affairs.

(160) And stretches on to include, e.g. GLYKAS (mid 12th century : KRUMBACHER, 380-5 ; ed. Bonn, 1836), a contemporary of Manasses who seems to have known his Chronicle. His own account was written to edify his son. He retains a high moral tone and is chiefly concerned with the implications to be drawn from the Old Testament. He touches on some points of legendary and ancient history (Sardanapalus, Herakles of Tyre, Croesus, Romulus, Alexander) but adds nothing to the structure. Joel (mid 13th century : KRUMBACHER, 385-8 ; ed. Bonn (1836) ; O. MAZAL, "Zur Überlieferung der Chronik des Joel", *JÖB* 16 (1967), 127-32) gives a very condensed account (derived from George Monachos) which touches on the conventional points (naming of the planets, Ninus, Herakles of Tyre, Daniel, founding of Rome, Alexander and biblical history from Abraham), but includes scarcely any Greek history (not even the Trojan War). Also worth nothing are Theodoros Skoutariotes (ed. K. SATHAS, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη* VII, 1896, 1-556), or the scraps in the *Βραχέα Χρονικά* (cf. P. SCHREINER, *Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, Vienna, 1975, n° 14). Perhaps the last representative of the line is the

Manasses, as might be expected, has added emphases of his own to the traditional attitudes.

He was writing at the court of Manuel I, who took many diplomatic and even military initiatives towards the recovery of imperial lands in Western Europe⁽¹⁶¹⁾. References to Rome Old and New which were always frequent in Byzantine court poetry reach a crescendo in Theodore Prodromos, who wrote of the victories of John and Manuel Comnenos⁽¹⁶²⁾. Old Rome is called in with increasing frequency to provide both a contrast to the vigour of the New Rome that is Constantinople, and a goal for its expansion⁽¹⁶³⁾.

Manasses contributed to the renewed interest in this theme⁽¹⁶⁴⁾. His Chronicle, which inevitably concentrated on Rome and its Emperors, stresses the glories of the city. After his account of the sack of the Old Rome by Gieserich he inserts a striking passage lamenting its passing, showing how strongly he perceives the connection between the Old and the New⁽¹⁶⁵⁾. Just how significant

compilation attached to the name of Dorotheos of Monemvasia and described as *Βιβλίον ἱστορικὸν περιέχον ἐν συνόψει διαφόρους καὶ ἐξόχους ἱστορίας ἀρχόμενον ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου μέχρι τῆς ἀλώσεως Κωνσταντινουπόλεως...* (Venice, 1684).

(161) See F. CHALANDON, *Les Comnènes II : Jean II Comnène et Manuel I Comnène* (Paris, 1912), especially 555-608 ; P. LAMMA, *Comneni e Staufer* (Rome, 1955-7) ; H.-G. BECK, "Byzanz und der Westen im 12. Jahrhundert", *Vorträge und Forschungen* 12 (1969), 227-241.

(162) W. HÖRANDNER, *Theodoros Prodromos : Historische Gedichte*, Wiener Byzantinische Studien XI (Vienna, 1974).

(163) E.g. W. HÖRANDNER, *op. cit.*, I, 105 ; XVI, 172-182 ; XVIII, 97-100 ; XX, 14-15. Such clichés were used from the foundation of the city ; cf. E. FENSTER, *Laudes Constantinopolitanae*, *Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia* 9 (Munich, 1968), especially 20-8, 55-96 and G. DAGRON, *Naissance d'une Capitale : Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* (Paris, 1974), 43-7. For the use made in the West of similar terminology, see W. HAMMER, "The Concept of the New or Second Rome in the Middle Ages", *Speculum* 19 (1944), 50-62.

(164) See F. DÖLGER, "Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner", *Byzanz und die Europäische Staatenwelt* (reprinted Darmstadt, 1953), 70-115, especially 96, note 4.

(165) Lament on Old Rome : MAN. 2523-52 ; on the connection between the Old and the New :

...στρέφει τὴν γνώμην ὅλην
ἐπὶ τὴν πανευδαίμονα πόλιν τῶν Βυζαντίων,
καὶ πόλιν ὀλβιόπολιν αὐτῇ προσανεγείρει,
πόλιν τὴν μεγαλόπολιν, πόλιν τὴν νέαν Ῥώμην,

this passage was to his readers becomes clear in the Slavic translation and adaptations⁽¹⁶⁶⁾. There the passages glorifying the Old Rome are expanded and made to refer to the successive empires which embody the mystic role of that which had perished⁽¹⁶⁷⁾. The section on the Trojan War that leads up to the founding of Rome is also adapted and expanded⁽¹⁶⁸⁾. A rhetorical response to the ambitions of a twelfth century ruler became one of the bases of a political theory that was to dominate Eastern Europe for centuries.

It is interesting to note that despite its learned language Manasses' Chronicle seems to have had a considerable impact on the more popular literature of Byzantium. The point of view it presented was felt to be sufficiently worth while to justify redactions and adaptations in prose⁽¹⁶⁹⁾. There are also a number of vernacular poems dealing with the Trojan War, all composed in the fourteenth century or later and all showing an awareness of the Trojan sections at least of Manasses' Chronicle⁽¹⁷⁰⁾. These reflections of the

Ῥώμην τὴν ἀρρυτίδωτον, τὴν μήποτε γηρῶσαν,
Ῥώμην αἰεὶ νεάζουσιν, αἰεὶ καινιζομένην,
Ῥώμην ἀφ' ἧς προχέονται χαρίτων αἱ συρμάδες,
ἣν ἡπειρος προσπτύσσεται, θάλασσα δεξιούται,
ἡπίως ἀγκαλίζονται παλάμαι τῆς Εὐρώπης,
ἀντιφιλεῖ δ' ἐτέρωθεν τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας στόμα. (MAN. 2348-55)

Cf. MAN. 3837-9.

(166) J. BOGDAN, *The Chronicle of Manasses*, Slavische Propyläen 12 (Munich, 1966); H. BOISSIN, *Le Manassès moyen-bulgare : Étude linguistique* (Paris, 1946); K. PRAECHTER, "Das griechische Original der rumänischen Troika", *BZ* 4 (1895), 519-46.

(167) H. SCHAEFER, *Moskau das dritte Rom : Studien zur Geschichte der politischen Theorie in der Slawischen Welt* (Darmstadt, 1957; 2nd ed.), especially 12-20; D. OBOLENSKY, *The Byzantine Commonwealth* (Oxford, 1971), 245-6, 414.

(168) Discussed in studies on the illustrations to Manasses by I. DUJČEV, *Miniaturite na Manasievata Letopis* (Sofia, 1962); A. HEISENBERG, "Über den Ursprung der illustrierten Chronik des Konstantin Manasses", *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildende Kunst* 5 (1928), 81-100.

(169) Cf. Th. PREGER, "Chronicon Georgii Codini : zur Vulgärparaphrase des Konstantin Manasses", *BZ* 4 (1895), 515-8.

(170) E.g. Hermoniakos (c. 1320) uses Tzetzes' *Allegories on the Iliad* and Manasses : cf. E. LEGRAND, *La Guerre de Troie* (Paris, 1890) and E. M. JEFFREYS, "Constantine Hermoniakos and Byzantine Education", *Dodone* 4 (1975), 82-109. *The War of Troy* (ed. in preparation by E. M. Jeffreys and M. Papatomopoulos) 9478-9 (lament for Achilles : cf. MAN. 1406-7), 12,348 (Palamedes : cf. MAN.

Chronicle in the least pretentious poetry preserved from Byzantium are an indication of the wide circulation of the political and historical ideas which the work contained.

At the end of this brief survey, however, several questions still present themselves. Did the chroniclers' view of ancient history have any influence in Byzantium outside their own pages, as the Slavic translation of Manasses was to be used in the imperial ideology of Eastern Europe⁽¹⁷¹⁾? Can one suggest whether the chroniclers' historical perspectives on the nature of the Byzantine Empire were accurate reflections of educated opinion? We have seen that the traditional view discussed here owed a great deal to the framework established by Africanus and Eusebius, and to the idiosyncratic insertion of episodes by Malalas; its development was affected by the simplifications likely in any story which is told too often. Did these individuals and the mechanisms of their tradition have any influence on the Byzantine view of themselves, or were they simply reflecting a conventional attitude? Chroniclers came to write ancient history in terms of the Bible and Rome; in their view the past seems to have been unaffected by Greece except for the forced migration of Aeneas after the sack of Troy, and for the conquests of Alexander. Did they have a positive role to play in the rejection of the Hellenic identity in Byzantium?

The internal evidence of the chronicle tradition suggests that the chroniclers were following opinion rather than guiding it, writing Roman and Christian history for a public who thought of themselves entirely in Roman and Christian terms. The erosion of the Greek element in their picture of ancient history is steady, and is never reversed. Not one of the very different writers who chose the chronicle frame for their history decided to add to the trivial role

1325). The *Achilleis*, MS N (ed. D. C. HESSELING, *L'Achilleïde Byzantine*, Amsterdam, 1919), 1764, 1765-8 (cf. Hesselings's comments on 141). *Troas* (Suppl. Gr. 926) 957-8 reflects *Ach.* N 1789-90 (cf. D. MICHAELIDES, "Palamedes Rediens: La Fortuna di Palamede nel Medioevo Ellenico", *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*, N.S. 8-9 (XVIII-XIX) (1971-2), 279).

(171) D. STRÉMOUKHOFF, "Moscow, the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine", *Speculum* 28 (1953), 84-101, esp. 86, 96; F. DÖLGER, "Die mittelalterliche Kultur auf dem Balkan als byzantinisches Erbe", in *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Darmstadt, 1953), 261-81.

traditionally assigned to Classical Greece ; equally Republican Rome was progressively ignored. Those chroniclers who had read most widely and thought most carefully about what they were doing – particularly Synkellos and Zonaras – removed Greek legend and history almost completely from their narrative. At a period when others were beginning for the first time in Byzantium to use "Ελληνες in a geographical and even nationalistic sense⁽¹⁷²⁾, Manasses was reading Herodotos for Persian history. A wider revival of Hellenic consciousness only came when the mystique of the New Rome was shattered by the Fourth Crusade⁽¹⁷³⁾.

Sydney.

Elizabeth M. JEFFREYS.

(172) See S. RUNCIMAN, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1970), 17-23, 77-8 and the review by R. BROWNING in *JHS* 91 (1971), 214-5 adding examples from Tornikes and Chrysoberges of a twelfth century pride in the Hellenic past. A. VAKALOPOULOS, *Ιστορία του νέου 'Ελληνισμού, Α'* : 'Αρχές και διαμόρφωσή του (Thessaloniki, 1961), 45-6, 66-77 (on thirteenth and fourteenth century usages) and IDEM, *Origins of the Greek nation : the Byzantine period 1204-1453* (trans. I. Moles, New Brunswick), 126-35 (but cf. reviews by C. MANGO, *JHS* 88 (1968), 256-8 and D. M. NICOL, *JHS* 92 (1972), 257). For a discussion of the meanings attached to the term 'Hellene' at different periods, see J. JÜTHNER, *Hellenen und Barbaren* (Leipzig, 1923) ; K. LECHNER, *Hellenen und Barbaren im Weltbild der Byzantiner* (Munich, 1954) ; P. CHARANIS, "Hellas in the Greek sources of the Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Centuries", *Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honour of Albert Mathias Friend Jr.* (Princeton, 1955), 172 ff. On the later periods, see H. DITTEN, "Βάρβαροι, 'Ελληνες und 'Ρωμαῖοι bei den letzten byzantinischen Geschichtschreibern", *Actes du XII^e Congrès International d'Études Byzantines II* (Belgrade, 1964), 273-99 ; D. M. NICOL, "The Byzantine Church and Hellenic Learning in the Fourteenth Century", *Studies in Church History* 5, ed. G. H. Cuming, (Leiden, 1969), 23-57.

(173) On the developing use of 'Hellene' by the fourteenth century, cf. H.-G. BECK, "Reichsidee und Nationale Politik im Spätbyzantinischen Staat", *BZ* 53 (1960), 86-94 ; S. RUNCIMAN, "Byzantine and Hellene in the fourteenth century", *Τόμος Κωνσταντίνου 'Αρμενοπούλου* (Thessaloniki, 1952). See too, I. ŠEVČENKO, "The decline of Byzantium seen through the eyes of its intellectuals", *DOP* 15 (1961), 169-86 ; D. J. ALEXANDER, "The Strength of Empire and Capital as seen through Byzantine Eyes", *Speculum* 37 (1962), 339-357.

H. HUNGER, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (Munich, 1978), I, chap. 4, discusses historians and chroniclers : this reached me too late to be incorporated here. His conclusions have little relevance to the argument of the present paper, but he provides full recent bibliographies for most of the authors mentioned.